A

CHRISTIAN,

SOBER and PLAIN

EXERCITATION

ON

The two grand practical Controversies of these Times;

INFANT-BAPTISM,

AND

SINGING OF PSALMS.

Wherein all the Scriptures on both sides are recited, opened and argued, with brevity and tenderneſſe: and whatever hath been largely diſcuſſed by others, briefly contracted in a ſpecial method for the edification of the SAINTS.

By *Cuthbert Sidenham*, Teacher to a Church of Chriſt in *Newcaſtle* upon *Tine*.

LONDON,

Printed by *Thomas Mabb*, and are to be ſold by *Francis Tyton* at the *three Daggers* in *Fleet-ſtreet*, neer the *Inner Temple-gate*. 1657.

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
GIFT FROM
DAVID H. McALPIN.

To his dear and honoured Brother, Mr. *William Durant*, my faithful Fellow-labourer in the Goſpel; And the Church of Chriſt, over whom the Holy Ghoſt hath made us Joynt-overſeers.

Dearly Beloved,

I *preſent you theſe firſt-fruits of my poor labours, as a pledge of my love, and teſtimony of my unfeigned deſires and longings after your ſettlement, and comfort together. I am indeared to you in the bowels of Chriſt, and for his ſake ow my ſelf unto you: My higheſt ambition in this world is, to ſee you ſtabliſhed in truth, and flouriſhing in the glorious graces of the Goſpel. I have treated on theſe two ſubjects, becauſe I know they are the tempting errours of theſe Times, and have the faireſt gloſſes ſet on them, and have too much influence to diſturb the Peace and*

Order of Churches: The first especially, which eats out mens affections, and creeps at the heart like a Gangrene insensibly; an opinion which hath been alwayes ominous, and of a wonderfull strange influence, accompanied with the most dangerous retinue of errours, since the first Embryo of it was brought forth; whether by a judgment of God, or from its natural and secret connexion with other principles of darkneſſe, I will not determine; onely God hath shewed some black characters on it in every Nation where it hath prevailed; though we cannot but say, many Saints are innocently under the power of it.

For the second, I hope when mens hearts come in Tune, their voyces will likewise: The former denies more Fundamental Principles, as the Covenant in its extent, and subjects; the freeneſs of Grace; the riches of its workings in the New Testament; and contracts the Gospel; leaving more Grace visible in the Legal and Old Testament dispensation, then in the New.

I have only summed up what others expreſs more at large, with something new, and never yet touched, that I know of: And as to the method,

thod, all is new, and made fit for your use, if Christ set it home on you. I have nothing else to add, but to tell you, you have been yet kept pure in the midst of many Distractions, and the violence of desperate Opinions: Take heed of plausible errours that come painted to you with the name of the most glorious truths: Lose not your glory at last; try and weigh every tittle that is propounded: Its my desire you may have the glorious Title given to you the Bereans *had, to be* (ευγενεστερους) *men of better breeding then to take up any thing on trust, though from the Apostles themselves, untill you know how they were inspired: Compare Scripture with Scripture; do not distract your selves in the Gospel; lay truths together, they will shine in their proper glory: Part not so easily with antient entailed priviledges: Have so much pity to your Children, as not to blot their names out of Heaven by your own hands, until God do it by soveraignty; do not bury them alive: Those that know the riches of such a priviledge, will not easily part with it upon such poor terms as most propose. I plead for poor Infants; and its but charity to speak for those whose tongues are tied. I intend brevity in this, as in all the following Discourse.*

The Lord fill you with wisdom and understanding, and give you to know what his perfect will is, and hearts to obey it: And thrive like Saints of the New Testament, that lie at Christs breasts night and day. *These are the desires of*

Your unworthy Teacher,

Cuthbert Sidenham.

CHAP. I.

Several Conſiderations premiſed, as an entrance to the Diſcourſe.

BEFORE I enter on the main Queſtions handled in this Diſcourſe, it will not be unneceſſary to premiſe ſomething in general concerning this Controverſie, which is ſuch a bone of contention among the Saints, for to make our way clear before us.

And 1. Let this be conſidered, that there is nothing in all the N. T. againſt the baptizing of Infants, not one hint from any expreſs word dropt from Chriſt or his Apoſtles; not one phraſe, which, though never ſo much ſtrain'd, doth forbid ſuch an act: but there is much for it in divers Scriptures compared together; and what is wanting in the one, is ſupplied in another abundantly, as hereafter will appear.

2. The ſum of all that our Oppoſites have to ſay, though they make a great deal of noiſe in the world, is only this, that they can find no ſyllabical precept, or word of command in terms, ſaying, Go baptize Infants, or any poſitive example where it is ſaid in ſo many words, Infants were baptized; only actual believers, as they believed, were baptized: all that they ſay beſides, is onely to quarrel with our arguments, and make ſhift to evade the ſtrength of them, but this is their onely argument, and their All; for however they talk of the Covenant, and fleſhly and ſpiritual ſeed, yet this is the *Goliahs* ſword, none like to it; I would therefore fairly encounter with it in the Portal, that I may ſee all their ſtrength before me.

Concerning which, take in theſe conſiderations: Firſt, this argument is built on this falſe principle, That no direct conſequences from Scripture are mandatory, and ſo obliging, nor of Divine Authority, which all Orthodox Profeſſors and Divines grant, but theſe which are againſt Infants-baptiſm; and it is moſt clear: For,

1. The way to know Scriptures, is by comparing them together, 1 *Cor.* 2. 13. and this muſt needs be by their Harmonie, and by deduction from one to another.

2. Without True conſequence were as Scripture, no one could ſpeak truth, but theſe that ſpeak juſt the very expreſſions of Scripture.

3. There could be no ſpiritual reaſons nor arguments uſed in any Diſcourſe to be of any force or con-

conſequence, though from the Scripture; for there can be no arguing from Scripture, but by conſequences and deduction; for in all arguments there muſt be a medium and a concluſion, a propoſition and an inference.

4. Nothing upon this account can be Scripture, but the very letters and ſyllables in the Bible; nothing of the meaning or ſenſe is Scripture; for you muſt draw out the ſenſe and meaning from the letters by rational conſequence, as the concluſion from a propoſition by a fit medium; and how abſurd would this prove, that letters ſhould be Scripture, and not the ſenſe? and ſo it muſt be according to that Maxime of theirs.

5. This is againſt all preaching, and expounding Scripture; nothing muſt be read but the very bare characters for to draw any deductions from; it is to no purpoſe, though never ſo direct and full; for if they be not Scripture, they cannot bind conſciences; and to what end is preaching, but to open and apply Scripture?

6. The ſearching of the Scripture were the moſt uſeleſs undertaking that could be imagined; for what need I ſearch, but read? for no conſequence, by compariſon of Scripture, is of authority to ſatisfy my conſcience, if I draw a concluſion from a Text, and perceive the meaning of it to be thus; if nothing without it be laid down in ſo many ſyllables, how many ſuch ſtrange abſurdities would follow the denying conſequences from ſcripture, which are purely,

de-

deducted? and by this principle, that where there are not ſo many letters put together in one ſentence, there is no command, men would ſoon draw Religion into a very narrow compaſſe.

7. This would be as much againſt themſelves; For,

Firſt, They have no command in ſo many words, Go and baptize actual or viſible believers: if they ſay ſuch were baptized: its anſwered, that is not to the purpoſe: for its a verbal command required by them to give warrant to an ordinance.

Secondly, *That* they muſt prove by conſequence alſo, believers were baptized, *Ergo* there was a command: Neither,

Thirdly Can they prove one act concerning their own form of baptizing by any command, but by conſequences: When they ſay Infants are not to be baptized, they draw it from conſequence thus, becauſe there is no command in their ſenſe; When they affirm the Covenant is not made with believers now, and their ſeed, as with *Abraham*, its drawn by conſequence, becauſe, ſay they, *Abraham* is no natural father to us, as to the Jews, and becauſe that covenant was a mixt Covenant, &c When they come to prove baptizing to be by plunging, they argue by conſequence, becauſe the word ſignifies it, becauſe they went where much water was, and went down into the water. &c. though they are miſtaken in all their conſequences, as I ſhall hereafter ſhew; yet this is full *ad hominem*, and againſt themſelves,

who

who deny conſequences to warrant inſtitutions, and yet have nothing for to prove their own way, but what is by conſequence from Scripture.

8. Its common among the Apoſtles to argue in ſuch a method, and to deduce one thing from another, to make out what they intended; 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. *We thus judge, if Chriſt died for all, then all are dead*; if the firſt be true, then the latter: ſo 1 *Cor.* 15. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. and all that Chapter, arguing out the reſurrection by fit mediums: ſo about the Ordinance of Baptiſm, *Acts* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, why theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we*? There was never any command to baptize theſe that had received the holy Ghoſt, not any example of any baptized on theſe terms; but the Apoſtle argues from the equivalency of the mercy, and the reaſon of the ſtate they were in; the ſame method he uſes 1 *Cor.* 10. 15, 16, 17, 18. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17, 18.

9. There will be hardly found a definition of the moſt doctrinal and high myſteries of the Goſpel, but by comparing Scripture with Scripture, and ſo making it forth by conſequence: what perfect definition of juſtification, or of juſtifying faith, in ſo many formal expreſſions in all the N. T. but what muſt be deducted by comparing Scriptures together to make one reſult? where are women either by ſuch a wordy expreſſion commanded to receive the Lords Supper? or any example? if they ſay (ἀνθρωπος) fig-

ſignifies both ſexes, yet it's ſtill by conſequence, no command or example: and why not (ἁγιος) as fit to ſignifie Infant Saints, as grown Saints, Infant-holineſs, as perfect holineſs? it's applied to both; if they will ſtick at a ſyllable, we may ſtick with them on the ſame grounds.

10. Deny conſequences to have the ſtrength of commands, and you will leave very few duties to be practis'd, or ſins to be avoided in the Old or New Teſtament: Expound the ten Commandements, the ſum of the Law, without conſequences, and very few ſhall be found litteral tranſgreſſors, but moſt deſperate debauched perſons. *Mat.* 5. Chriſt expounds the whole Law, and by conſequences from the inward meaning, draws out new conſiderations of duties; and ſince the Bible is but a ſhort ſyſteme of Religion, every place is fitted to expound each other; and this muſt be done by rational-ſpiritual compariſons and inferences; but enough to the firſt conſideration on this head of commands and conſequences.

2. Where we have a promiſe laid as the foundation of a duty, that is equivalent to any expreſs command; for as commands in the *Goſpel* do ſuppoſe promiſes, to encourage us to act them, and help us in them: ſo promiſes made to perſons do include commands, eſpecially when the duties commanded are annexed to the promiſes, as all New Teſtament Ordinances are, as well as Old.

3. We have as much in the N. T. to prove Infant-baptiſm, from the true principles of right to Ordi-

Ordinances, as they have for these whom they baptize; for they baptize grown persons on such and such considerations: and we shall hereafter shew, we baptize on as strong and equivalent grounds; and thats enough to warrant a command, to demonstrate the same substantial grounds of the command to reach the same case.

4. If we can find no positive command in so many words for their baptizing (shewing the same fundamental grounds) it's requisite they should shew us some express command to the contrary, and some authentick repeal, seeing Infants so long enjoyed such a like Ordinance: Upon the same grounds Christ would not have taken away such an ancient priviledge, when his grace abounded, and superabounded, but he would have left some character of it in the Gospel, and entred some formal discharge in his Word of such persons, and given a warning of it to the Gentile-beleivers to expect it; but he hath both by his words and carriages left clear demonstrations, that he is so far from repealing, as he confirms it to Infants; let the Scriptures opened hereafter speak to this.

The third consideration premised is this, as all that they urge as to examples of actual believers, being baptized, all along the New Testament, especially the *Acts*, and that if thou believest thou mayest, &c. we can freely grant without any damage to this truth: For,

1. We say as they, professing believers, grown men:

men were first baptized, and so they ought to be, who are to be the first subjects of the administration of an Ordinance, persons able to give an account of their own faith; it was so with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. 24. he was 99. years old when he was circumcised, and he must be first circumcised before he could convey a right to his seed; now you may as well argue, *Abraham* was first circumcised when so old, therefore old persons are to be circumcised, and none else; as because grown persons were baptized, therefore not Infants, when they must be first baptized themselves; for Children are baptized by the promise first to them, and in them to their seed.

2. An affirmative position is not exclusive of subordinates; because believers were said to be baptized, *Ergo* not their seed, is not true reasoning; for their seed were comprehended with them in the same promise.

3. *A non dicto ad non factum, non valet consequentia*, as Divines say; because its not expresst in so many words, therefore it was not done, is no argument: especially when there is enough to shew it was done, though not written; Christ speaks short, that we may search he expects N.T. Saints to be so ingenuous as to take more by a hint, than those of the Old, who were not so bred as we now; they had every pin of the Tabernacle appointed; its not so punctually set down now, either as to Churches, or Government, but onely the main substantials laid down, and its left to the ingenuity of the Saints to draw forth the consequences. Lastly

Laſtly, to premiſe no more; God hath alwayes ordained ſome Ordinances; in the adminiſtration of which, for the moſt part, the ſubject hath been purely paſſive, to expreſs his own free grace moſt eminently as Circumciſion on Infants; And can we think he hath left no Ordinance now as a viſible character, only to hold forth his meer grace in the N. T. where he reigns by grace? And there is no ſign ſo fit to expreſs it as Baptiſm, and no ſubject ſo capable as poor Infants.

CHAP. II.

About the nature of the Covenant made with Abraham.

THE firſt great thing in this Controverſie is, to conſider the nature of the Covenant, which is the firſt foundation of the priviledge to believers, and their ſeed, as it was firſt made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, in the name of all believers, and their ſeed both Jews and Gentiles; for ſo large is the extent of that Covenant to both, as hereafter ſhall be proved from New Teſtament expreſſions; and if we find the ſame Covenant reaching Gentile-believers, and their Children, as *Abraham* and his, we cannot be denyed the new external ſign and ſeal of the ſame Cove-

Covenant; for though the outward ſignes may be changed, yet there is no change of the priviledges, if the Covenant remain entire. For the opening of which we ſhall conſider,

1. The nature of *Abrahams* Covenant.
2. How perſons may be ſaid to be in that Covenant.

For the firſt, we muſt begin with that place *Gen.* 17. where God began not onely to expreſſe the Covenant in larger terms than formerly, but to adde a viſible ſeal to it, *viz.* that of Circumciſion: There be many conjectures about this Covenant; thoſe that differ, conceive it to be a mixt Covenant, made up of ſpiritual and temporal bleſſings together, and not of the ſame purity with the Covenant in the New Teſtament, and ſo make a carnal part, and a ſpiritual part of it, and Circumciſion to be annexed eſpecially to the former, not ſo to the latter; this is the true relation of their judgement about this Let us review the Covenant, and its terms, and we ſhall ſoon finde the miſtake.

Firſt, and chiefly We affirm this was a Covenant of pure grace, the ſame in ſubſtance with the Covenant adminiſtred now under the Goſpel, ſince Chriſts coming in the fleſh and ſpirit.

1. It was founded upon pure grace, Gods love to *Abraham*, and 'tis not any thing in *Abraham*, or his, to move God more than to the Gentiles.

2. It was a Covenant without works, therefore of pure grace, *Rom.* 4. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. and all along the Chapter.

3. It

3. It was a Covenant made onely with a believer upon Gospel terms; the same the New Testament holds forth in the 3, 4, and 5. v. of that Chapter; now faith is the onely condition of the Covenant of grace.

4. It was a Covenant made in Christ, and therefore a pure Covenant of Grace, as any can be in the Gospel, *Gal* 3. 16, 17, 18, and 29.

5. Consider the tenure of this Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, to be a God to thee, and thy seed after thee.* Here is the substance and strength of this Covenant, to be a God to *Abraham* and to his seed; and what can be more, than to be *Jehovah* to him? can there be any expression more high, or that can set forth more grace and purity than this? Its more than can be exprest, that God engageth his Deity to him; and it is as much as if God had said, whatever I am in mine own Godhead, I will be to thee and thy seed, to make you happy and blessed: This is the first and main thing premised, and it comprehends Christ, grace, glory, all blessings above imagination; the Apostle in *Heb.* 8. 10. useth the same expression as the sum of all, when he speaks of the new Covenant, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.* We need adde no more, if that were not a Covenant of pure grace, the Gospel knows none other.

That which they have to say why it's a mixt Covenant, and a temporal, as some of the most ignorant

affirm, is from the following expreſſion of *Gen.* 17.8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a ſtranger, all the Land of Canaan, for an everlaſting poſſeſſion, &c.* Now ſay they, if the promiſes be mixt, ſo is the Covenant.

To which I anſwer, that the Land of *Canaan*, and ſuch like promiſes, were but additional, and added *ex ſuperabundanti*, to the firſt promiſe, not at all incorporated to the bulk and body of the Covenant which was made in Chriſt, and conſiſted of more pure conſiderations: theſe promiſes were but fitted to the outward adminiſtration of the firſt promiſe of grace, and the ſtate of *Abrahams* family, but there was no mixture; For,

1. The Covenant with *Abraham* is repeated in the New Teſtament entire, without any of thoſe additions, as is proved formerly.

2. The promiſe of *Canaan* was typical of heaven, and ſo did but more open the firſt promiſe, to be their God; ſhewing them that God would bring him and his to Heaven, and the fulneſs of his glory, as he would bring them to an outward *Canaan*; and this was ſuited to Gods deſign, in adminiſtring that vaſt promiſe by types and outward figures: ſo *Abraham* cloſed in with it by faith, as a promiſe, expounding figuratively the ſubſtance of the Covenant, *Heb.* 11. 8,9,10. ſo 13,14.15,16. So that the firſt promiſe was poſitive, and ſhewed the nature of the covenant; the other was typically expoſitory, *Canaan* ſetting out Heaven, and the eternity of their reſt with this

God

God in Covenant; and this will no more make a mixt Covenant, than the type and the ſubſtance when they meet together will differ in ſignification.

3. We may as well ſay, theſe promiſes in the New Teſtament make up a mixt Covenant, and ſo of a different nature, when God ſaith in *Mat.* 6. 33. *Seek firſt the Kingdome of God, and all things elſe ſhall be added*; and 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. *Godlineſſe hath the promiſe of this life, and that which is to come*; which are as much mixt as ever the Covenant made with *Abraham* was; whereas all know, theſe are but accidental appendices of the promiſe of grace, and diſpenſed according to the uſe he hath for, and the conditions of his Saints: thus *Canaan* was added to the Covenant, as all other things to the kingdom of God.

4. If this be a mixt Covenant, becauſe *Canaan* is added, and the like, then how comes it to be the ſame in the N. T. and to be of force now, when no notice is taken of *Canaan*, and the temporal promiſes? Sure in this mixture the promiſe of free grace was primary, and like oyl at top; for *Abrahams* Covenant the very ſame for ſubſtance is clear, and without mixture in the Goſpel, though it is adminiſtred externally, as it was then, and the bleſſings of *Abraham* come on the Gentiles, though not of an externall *Canaan*.

If they ſay that *Canaan* was added onely for the diſpenſation of the Covenant to the Jews, its granted; but that it ſhould make a mixture in the Cove-

nant, is most false which is the same for ever, though the outward administration be different; things may be added, yet not mixt, as a mans cloaths to his body, and yet there is no mixture between a mans flesh and his cloaths.

But let us come to Circumcision, the seal of this Covenant: it sealed it, say they, as a mixt Covenant.

Then 1. It sealed the one part aswell as the other: take it in their own sense, that is, it sealed God to be their God, as *Canaan*; and so it was not a seal meerly to a temporal promise.

2. If the Covenant was so mixt in the nature of it, then Circumcision sealed unequally, though it was added to a mixt Covenant, for it sealed the promise of *Canaan* to those that never went into *Canaan*, as many that died before that time, and afterwards many that were circumcised died in the Wilderness, and under Gods wrath, and so sealed nothing at all, neither part of the Covenant visibly, and that is hard, that so many there should be neither the fulfilling of spiritual, nor temporal part of the promise.

3. Grant them this Covenant was mixt, then it was either in the substance, or circumstances; if in the substance then *Abrahams* Covenant was not Gospel, and believers must seek for another Father, as to the example of faith, and that were to make it rather like *Nebuchadnezzars* Image of Iron and Clay, than made up of Gospel-materials; if in circum-

cumstances of administration, and additaments of external types, it's granted, and we have the same promise now, with new outward administrations; if this mixture were in the nature and substance of the *Covenant*, then it must remain as long as the *Covenant* lasted, and so unto this day; for no man is so bold (though many are bold enough) as to say, that *Abrahams* Covenant is abrogated; if it be under any other consideration, it's easily waved, and the truth the same. So that Circumcision sealed the *Covenant* primarily in its nature, as a Covenant of grace, and *God* being a *God* to circumcise their hearts, *&c.* and *Canaan*, & other things consequently and accidentally, as God made a promise of them, for the better visible administration of the Covenant to them in that external policy. And surely its beyond an ordinary reach to believe, that God should make a *Covenant* with *Abraham*, and for his faith in it should create him the Father of the faithfull in all ages, and this Covenant should be brought in the N. T. and renewed, and the tenure of it freshly held forth to believers there, and yet at the first making of it God should mix temporal promises with the spiritual substance of it, and annex a seal that should onely or specially seal the temporal part of it, and so poorly confirm the main and essential nature of it, especially when God speaking of *Abrahams* faith, stiles Circumcision the seal of the righteousness of it, *Rom.* 4. But of this more in another Chapter.

CHAP. III.

The distinction of Abrahams *seed into fleshly and spirituall, into naturall and believing, considered; whether the Infants of believers may not be called in the New Testament, the seed of* Abraham *?*

THE next thing which must have its place of consideration, is that question of *Abrahams* seed, with whom the promise was made; and upon this hinge hangs all the main weight on both sides; and if we make out Infants of believers in the N. T. to be in the Covenant, as *Abrahams* seed, the controversie would be at end: To make out this, the most of the following Chapters are designed; only in this we shall fall more directly on the question it self.

Those that differ from us make many distinctions of a fleshly carnal seed of *Abraham*, and of a spiritual seed, a believing and a natural seed, which distinctions are taken out of *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 23. and *Chap* 3. 16. and most true, if well applied; but before I come to open the Scriptures, *I* would premise these considerations concerning *Abraham* and his seed.

1. That

1. That *Abrahams* ſpirituall ſeed were as much his fleſhly ſeed alſo, *Iſaac* as *Iſhmael*, except Proſelytes and Servants.

2. The Covenant was adminiſtred to all *Abrahams* natural and fleſhly Children, as if they had been ſpiritual, and before they knew what faith was, or could actually profeſs *Abrahams* faith.

3. It's no contradiction in different reſpects, to be a ſeed of the fleſh by natural generation, and a Child under the ſame promiſe made with the Parent; for they both agreed in *Abrahams* caſe; none was a Child of promiſe, but as he came of *Abrahams* fleſh: and as he came from *Abrahams* fleſh, ſo every one had the ſeal of Gods Covenant on his fleſh: Thus a ſpiritual promiſe was made with *Abraham* and his carnal ſeed

4. There was no diſtinction of *Abrahams* fleſhly ſeed and his ſpiritual ſeed, in the Old Teſtament, but all comprehended under the ſame Covenant, untill they degenerated from *Abrahams* faith, and proved themſelves to be meer carnal, and rejected the promiſe.

5. There is a carnall and ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*, even under the N. T. as our oppoſites muſt acknowledg, as well as Infants; ſo are the moſt viſible Profeſſors which they baptize: which may have no grace; and many prove carnal indeed, through the predominancy of their luſts and corruptions.

6. When there is mention of *Abrahams* carnall ſeed in oppoſition to ſpiritual ſeed, it cannot be

meant primarily or ſolely of thoſe that deſcended from *Abrahams* fleſh: for then *Iſaac* and *Jacob* were the carnall ſeed, yea, Chriſt himſelf, who as concerning the fleſh came of *Abraham*; it muſt be therefore of thoſe of *Abrahams* ſeed which degenerated, and ſlighted the Covenant of the Goſpel, and theſe were properly the carnal ſeed.

Sutable to this is that diſtinction of *Abraham* being a natural and a ſpiritual Father: For,

First, He was a natural Father to theſe to whom he was a ſpiritual Father, as to *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, and the godly of their poſterity.

Secondly, All to whom he was a natural Father were under the Covenant, and had the ſeal, untill they rejected themſelves; the promiſe took in both relations, as to outward adminiſtration, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4. And if men truely ſtate things, you may argue as much againſt *Abrahams* natural ſeed from enjoying theſe priviledges, as believers natural ſeed now, and with as much evidence of truth.

But let us weigh theſe Scriptures which are brought by our Oppoſites: First, conſider that of *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *They are not all* Iſrael *that are of* Iſrael; *neither becauſe they are the ſeed of* Abraham *are they all Children, but in* Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*; *that is, they which are the Children of the fleſh, theſe are not the Children of God: but the Children of promiſe are accounted for the ſeed.*

The Apoſtle in this Chapter doth with a bleeding heart begin the ſad ſtory of the Jews rejection from being

being a Church, and speaks as one loath to mention it, and therefore brings it in with a passionate and hearty Apology, v. 1, 2, 3. he was in heavinesse, he could wish himself ἀνάθεμα, accursed from Christ, for his brethren, his Kinsmen according to the flesh, that is, for these that we call Jews according to the flesh.

Q. But what needed all this trouble to have a carnal generation of men cut off? Why doth *Paul* take on so heavily?

Sol. In the 4, and 5, v. he tells you, *Who are Israelites, to whom pertains the adoption of glory, and the Covenant, and the giving of the Law, and the service of God, and the promises, whose are the* Fathers, *of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came*; Here is a Catalogue of high priviledges which belonged to the Jews, which they were to be cut off from, which lay on *Pauls* heart, and was like to sink him.

Obj. Well, might some say, v. 6. then the promise of God is in vain, if they be rejected unto whom the adoption and the promises belong.

Sol. The Apostle anticipates that Objection, Not as though the Word of God hath taken no effect; no, the promise is the same, and immutable; *but they are not all* Israell *which are of* Israell; neither because they are the seed of *Abraham*, are they all Children, *&c.* This is the very natural coherence of these words; let us now use our judgements to distinguish and review the place, and we shall finde it a weapon whose edge is turned against these that count it their own.

1. The

1. The Apoſtle is ſadly troubled for his kinſmen after the fleſh, for their rejection; his reaſon is, becauſe of the *Covenant*, and the promiſes made to them, becauſe they were the natural ſeed of *Abraham*: which holds forth that the promiſes and the priviledges of the *Covenant* were made indefinitely to all the *Iſraelites*.

2. That it's a moſt ſad thing to be excluded from the outward and general adminiſtration of the *Covenant*. Why ſhould *Paul* thus break out in his affections, for the loſs of outward priviledges, if it were not ſuch a mercy to be under them?

3. The Apoſtle holds forth, that perſons may be under the outward adminiſtrations of the *Covenant*, and yet not get the efficacy of it; v. 6. *They are not all* Iſrael *that are of* Iſrael; the *Covenant* was made with *Abraham* and his ſeed, all that were of him: and yet all were not *Iſrael*, that is, partakers of the inward life and efficacy of the *Covenant*; the Apoſtle onely in theſe verſes endeavours to take off that Objection, that *God* had broke his *Covenant* by caſting away the *Jews*, and ſo diſtinguiſheth of theſe that were meerly of his fleſh, who had the outward adminiſtration, but not the inward fruit, and theſe which were elect in the promiſe, in Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*; the reſt he calls the *Children* of the fleſh, the former the *Children* of promiſe, v. 8. and ſo though they were under the outward diſpenſation of the *Covenant*, yet *God* was not mutable, nor his promiſe, though he rejected them, becauſe of their own

own degeneration; ſo that the ſumme of this place is,

1. That the Covenant was made in general with *Abrahams* ſeed, to all that came from him.

2. That in the adminiſtration of general and indefinite promiſes, there is a ſecret diſtinction, and a vein of election carried through the adminiſtration, that takes hold of ſome, not of others.

3. That none are the Children of promiſe, real Saints, but thoſe that have the true effects of the Covenant in their hearts.

4. That all children of Believers, though the promiſe viſibly belong to them, as to *Abraham* and his ſeed, yet may not follow their Parents faith, and ſo not be *Iſrael*, though of *Iſrael*.

But here is nothing at all to demonſtrate that Infants, becauſe Children of the fleſh, are not under the promiſe: but rather the contrary, for in Iſaac *ſhall thy ſeed be called*, ſaith God: now he was a Child of *Abrahams* fleſh, as well as thoſe that were caſt off, and yet a Child of promiſe; ſo God makes his Covenant indefinitely with Believers and their ſeed, and yet the efficacy of the Covenant may reach but ſome, an *Iſaac* or a *Jacob*, an elect veſſel, and yet the other under the outward adminiſtration, untill they manifeſt the contrary: But more of this from that, *Acts* 2. 38, 39.

I come now to that other place ſo much urged by them, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to* Abraham *and his ſeed were the promiſes made; he ſaith not to ſeeds, as of many, but*

but of one which is Christ: Now by Christ here cannot be meant barely Christ personal: for then no believer should be accounted for the seed but onely Christ: it must be meant of Christ mystically, or Politically considered, as the visible Head of the Church; if to Christ mystical, then to all the Elect as in him, and so to Infants as well as grown persons, who make up that mystical body; but thus the promise is conveyed under ground as it were, none knows the vein of it: thus in the Old Testament flesh and flesh came from *Abraham*, the Covenant administred to them both by its seal, yet one flesh enjoying the spiritual blessings, the other rejected.

Take the promise to be made to Christ, the seed, as the Head of a visible Church, then still it speaks for us; for Infants of believers were never cast out of the visible Church they were once in; and the promise is made now to them with their Parents, as shall be hereafter proved at large: but if we look no farther back then the 14. v. of this Chapter, we shall receive some light to this: Its said in the 13. v. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, &c. that the blessing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles through Christ*: *Abrahams* blessing what was it, but the promises, and the fruits, and priviledges of the promise and Covenant made to him and his seed? The same blessing is now come on the Gentiles, but through Christ, who took away all obstructions in the passage of the Covenant by his death: Now,

1. This bleſſing of *Abraham* was not perſonal, but to him and his ſeed.

2. This very bleſſing is come on Gentile believers, as on *Abraham*: therefore it muſt come on believers of the Gentiles, and their ſeed alſo. For,

3. It cannot be called *Abrahams* bleſſing, except it come on the Gentiles according to the ſubſtantial terms of *Abrahams* Covenant: Now this was the abſolute form of *Abrahams* bleſſing, *I will be a God of thee and of thy ſeed*; and this very bleſſing is come on the Gentiles through Chriſt, as it came on *Abraham*; and therefore it muſt be to believing Gentiles, and their ſeed: elſe it will neither be *Abrahams* bleſſing in the form, nor fatneſs of it; *Abrahams* bleſſing will deſcend on the Gentiles clipt half off, not like it ſelf: And it muſt needs be a very uncouth ſaying to all judicious ears, to ſay, that *Abrahams* bleſſing is come on the Gentiles by Chriſt, as it was on the Jews by *Abraham*, and exclude half the Subjects at once from any right to it; for ſo you muſt, if you caſt out the ſeed of Gentile believers.

And to what end ſhould the Apoſtle ſay, The bleſſing of *Abraham*, and not the promiſe or Covenant is come to the Gentiles, but that he intended it to the Gentile believers and their ſeed, as formerly it came to *Abraham* and his? This ſhall be further cleared from *Acts* 2. and *Rom* 11. in their order.

But in *Gal.* 3. 29. the Apoſtle (ſay they) deſcribes who are the ſeed; *If you be Chriſts, then you are* Abrahams

Abrahams *ſeed, and heirs according to promiſe:* So that now no Children born of believing Parents can be the ſeed; for they muſt be Chriſts, according to that in v. 26. *We are all the Children of God through faith in Chriſt Jeſus.*

In general, not to omit that which *Beza* ſaith on the place, that *Claramontanus* Bible hath the words thus, and as he thinks more right. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ, *If you be one in Chriſt, then ye are* Abrahams *ſeed:* This is ſuitable to the former verſe, where he ſaith, *There is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free,* &c. *but ye are all one in Chriſt Jeſus; and if ye be all one, then* Abrahams *ſeed:* From which,

1. It's clear the Apoſtle is endeavouring to take way all difference between Jew and Gentile, and to old forth their unity in Chriſt, where there is no diſtinction as formerly: but now the Gentiles being ne in Chriſt, are *Abrahams* ſeed, as well as the natural and believing Jews.

2. The *Apoſtle* here hath no intent to ſhew the diſtinction of *Abrahams* ſeed as the ſubject of the outward priviledges, and adminiſtrations of Ordinances, but to ſhew that none are ſpiritually and really *Abrahams* ſeed, and heirs of promiſe, but ſuch as are Chriſts, one in him with *Abraham*: For if this ſhould be the diſtinction of ſeed as the ſubject of outward Ordinances, it would be as much againſt profeſſing believers as Infants; for there is a carnal profeſſion as well as a fleſhly generation, the former more abominable.

The

The Propoſition from this expreſſion, as they draw it, is thus; None but theſe who are Chriſts are *Abrahams* ſeed, and none are Chriſts but real believers, and therefore none but they muſt be baptized.

Thus ſome ſay (though weakly) The ſpiritual ſeed and now the ſubject of Baptiſm, the new Creature, the man in Chriſt, Baptiſm knows no fleſh, with many ſuch like expreſſions from this and other places: But let us weigh things.

1. If none but ſuch are *Abrahams* ſeed, and ſo none but ſuch the ſubject of Baptiſm, then viſible believers are not the ſubject of Baptiſm; for they may not be Chriſts, or new Creatures, no more than Infants; hardly one among twenty that are truly in Chriſt among the moſt glorious of them, and ſo not *Abrahams* ſeed.

2. None muſt be baptized at all upon this account; for who knows who is Chriſts according to election and ſaving faith?

If they ſay, We have charitable grounds to believe ſo of viſible Profeſſors, untill we ſee the contrary;

I anſwer, This is nothing to the Queſtion, as it is ſtated, nor as it lies in the Text; the Text ſaith, *If ye be Chriſts, then ye are* Abrahams *ſeed:* You ſay none are in Chriſt but real believers, and yon muſt baptize none but a ſpiritual ſeed, and new Creatures, which will require not onely a judgement of charity, but infallibility to determine.

2. The

2. The Apoſtle is here deſcribing what the real ſeed and ſpiritual ſeed are, as having an inward right to Chriſt, and not what the apparent ſeed of *Abrahams* was: For,

1. Mark whom he ſpeaks unto; to grown perſons, the *Galatians*, who were viſible Profeſſors and Believers.

2. He puts them to a trial of themſelves, whether they were Chriſts or no, after they had made a profeſſion; for they having legaliz'd, and returned to look after Jewiſh Ordinances and works, he tells them, their Ordinances were nothing, their priviledges nothing, being Jew or Greek, but as they were in Chriſt: The ſame he follows on, Chap. 6. 15. *In Chriſt neither circumciſion nor uncircumciſion availeth any thing, but a new Creature:* So that the Apoſtle here puts an [*If*] to the profeſſing *Galatians*, *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye* Abrahams *ſeed.*

3. If you have no more but the judgement of your charity to diſtinguiſh thus of men in Chriſt, real believers, and *Abrahams* ſeed, then we have the ſame ground of charity to act on Infants of believers: For,

1. They may be Chriſts as well as grown perſons.

2. God would have us account them holy, as we ſhall prove from that, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

3. Seeing they have been taken into the ſame Covenant.

4. Seeing

4. Seeing Christ shewed so much respect to Infants, when brought to him. To judge a visible Professor to be Christs, and *Abrahams* seed, I have nothing but the purblinde eye of my probable judgment. To judg a Believers Infant Christe, I have a general Scripture assertion, and the ground of an indefinite promise, which is more then all my conjectures: So that,

1. Visible Professors are not the spiritual seed of *Abraham*; for they may not be Christ's; therefore there is no spiritual seed but these that have saving faith, which all have not.

2. Infants of believers are as much the spiritual seed of *Abraham* as visible professing believers, and we have as much ground to judge of the one as the other, untill they manifest the contrary; and our of judgment on them may have less deceit in it then there is in that we pass on grown persons.

3. If you will distinguish of *Abrahams* fleshly seed & spiritual under the Gospel, you cannot apply it to Infants, but to professing believers; for the children of believers are not the fleshly seed of *Abraham*; but if there be any such distinction, it must be between visible grown Professors, of whom some are spiritual, & Christ's; & others carnal, & born under Mount *Sinai*, and not Christs.

4. Its a true rule in Logick, that in every good division, *Partes debent inter se opponi*, The Parts ought to be opposite: Now to be born from *Abraham* both as a natural & spiritual Father, was

both cõmon, through the promiſe in the old Teſtament, & not univerſally oppoſite; & ſo it may be now, an Infant is born of the fleſh of a believer yet the Covenant makes the believer a ſpiritual Father in ſome reſpects, as well as a natural.

5. The Seed takes its demonſtration from the Covenant, and its tenure; & if the Covenant be made to *Abraham* and his ſeed, and theſe were at firſt Infants of his body, and renewed with believers in the N. T. as we ſhall prove in the following Diſcourſe: then Infants of believers are the ſeed now as well as formerly, *Abraham* only being the firſt root and Father.

6. Viſibility of profeſſion doth no more make a man of the ſpiritual ſeed, and ſo Chriſt's now under the New Teſtament, then the Covenant in its outward adminiſtration in the Old, made all the Jews and their Children really new Creatures, and a ſpiritual ſeed; for under the one and the other, perſons may be carnal.

All theſe conſiderations are to ſhew that theſe places of Scripture are miſtaken, and do not ſhew who is the ſeed as to Ordinances, but who are the ſeed as to election & ſalvation; & that Infants may be as well the ſeed, notwithſtanding all theſe places, as well as viſible Profeſſors.

Q. If any ſay, But we have no warrant to judge of any but by viſible profeſſion.

Sol. 1. Let us judge as God would have us, & we ſhall finde as much ground to paſs ſuch a judge-

ment

ment on Infants as them; if God call them holy we may do ſo, and it will be dangerous then to call them uncleane.

2. The promiſe is the ſurer way of judging, ſeeing at beſt we can but judge externally, and with hopes; & it's better to rely on God, & to expect what he will do through his promiſe, at leaſt on ſome, then to truſt my own judgement.

3. The Word owns Infants of believers viſibly, as we own viſible Profeſſors, as the Scriptures following will demonſtrate.

For the preſent, ſeriouſly view all theſe places together, *Gen.* 17.7. *Acts* 2.38,39. *Deut.* 30.6.11, 12,13,14. *Rom.* 10. 1. 6,7,8. with *Heb.* 8.10,11. *Jer.* 31. 22. *Eſay.* 65.23. with many ſuch places, that hold forth the ſeed to Infants as well in the *New* Teſtament as in the Old.

I end this chapter with this conſideration, that if you exclude Infants of believers to be *Abrahams* ſeed, upon this ground, becauſe they are not the ſpiritual ſeed: then daſh out the name as well of grown Profeſſors to be *Abrahams* ſeed, who are no more ſo really becauſe of that, then theſe Infants, and we ſhall quit the one with the other, & then there ſhall be found no viſible ſubjects of Baptiſm either of infants or grown perſons: for they are both, as to election & inward grace, unknown to us to be *Abrahams* ſeed; they were both formerly accounted *Abrahams* ſeed, grown perſons, *and infants eſpecially by the Covenant*;

and now the one is to be accounted *Abrahams* seed, *viz.* grown persons professing; though they may have no right to the inward grace of the Covenant; and Infants who had first right next to *Abraham*, must be excluded, though they have never so real an interest, because they are Infants, and cannot speak for themselves: But so much of this; the next Chapter will second this.

CHAP. IV.

How any person may be said to be in the Covenant; the divers considerations about it.

TO the former let this be added, because it seems strange how any can be in Covenant, & yet not partake of salvation. In opening of this, the common distinctions of all Divines must be repeated, that according as there is an internal and external administration of the Covenant, so there is a twofold being in the Covenant.

1. *Secundum propositum electionis*, According to the purpose of election in Gods heart, and his eternal decree; so only the elect, and these which have saving faith, are in Covenant: this some call and not improperly, to be intentionally in Covenant, God principally intending the Covenant to them; others call it spiritually and savingly from the effect.

2. There is a being in Covenant *in facie visibilis Ecclesiæ*,

Ecclesiæ, In the face, or according to the judgment of a visible Church, where judgement and charity are mixt together, *Rom* 9.4. *Deut*. 29.10,12,13, 14. *Job*. 15.2. *Joh*. 1.11, *Psal*. 50.5. with variety of Scripture: And of such there are two sorts.

1. Such as stand by their own visible profession; as all first Covenanters do, so all visible Sts now, & so many Proselytes in the Old Testament, *Exod*. 12.44,45. *Deut*. 29.10,11. *Gen*. 12.5. Or else, 2. As in a Political Moral consideration, as in the right of another through a free promise; as if a Prince give a title of Honor, or a piece of land to one & his heirs, they are all interested in it, yet some prove fools, or traitors, and are afterwards incapable: Its so in this, and was with *Abraham* and his seed: Now that this distinction holds in the New Testament, I shall thus discover to you.

1. If men deny an external, as well as internal being in Covenant, none can administer an external Ordinance, an outward sign to any; for we must go by external rules in these actings.

2. Visible Professors will have the worst of it; for we must administer no Ordinance to these which are not internally in Covenant; and we have no proof but their own expressions, and our good hopes, and present probable judgment to warrant us, & many visible miscarriages to contradict our judgments & hopes at special times.

3. We set a seal to a blank to all grown persons, who are baptized, or receive the Lords Sup-

per, without we know them certainly in the covenant; and that who knows? for our judgement will no more hinder the ſeal from being a blank to grown Profeſſors then to Infants, without they prove real at laſt.

4. The beſt evidence you can have from any of their being in Covenant, is but viſible expreſſions, ſuppoſitions, and hopes, and probabilities, all which you muſt help out by your own charity, and fallible obſervation; for God hath promiſed no ſeal on my ſpirit for another mans condition; it's a bleſſed mercy if I get the ſeal on my own heart for my ſelf.

So that the great Queſtion will be anſwered from this, which Mr. *Tombes* and they all urge, That if God made the Covenant with believers, and their ſeed, they muſt all be ſaved, &c. With which I ſhall but thus parly.

1. Doth God make the Covenant of ſalvation with every viſible Profeſſor whom they baptize? or with every viſible Saint? or do they baptize them out of Covenant? Then how come any to fall off, and be damned? or what rule have they to baptize by?

2. Why ſhould it be thought more hainous to ſet a ſeal on Infants, as in the Covenant, then on theſe Profeſſors which afterwards prove not to be in Covenant?

3. Or do they baptize, becauſe that perſons are in the Covenant? If not, then upon no ſpiritual account

count; if upon their being in Covenant, then either internally or externally; on the first it cannot be absolutely, but as manifested externally; not upon a meer external being in Covenant; for then they may set a seal to a blank: if upon both together, the one externally demonstrated by the other, then it is still by the external being in Covenant that we judg with hopes of the other. There is a trick that some have got, wherby they think to evade this being in Covenant, as the fundamental ground of Baptism, by this distinction; That it is not being in Covenant, but being an actual Believer, gives right: *To which I answer.*

1. That the Covenant, take it spiritually, is the ground of faith, not faith of the Covenant.

2. If the Covenant be the ground of faith (for who can believe without a promise?) it may well be the ground of an outward priviledge.

3. To separate the Covenant from the conveyance of actual priviledges, is almost as dangerous as to separate actual faith from the Covenant; for the one gives a right as well as the other.

4. Infants in the Old Testament were thus as really to be esteemed in the Covenant, as actual visible Believers are now; and under the external administration of the Covenant, as the Proselytes who came in to the Jewish Church, and were the first fruits of the Gentiles.

For that there is an external administration of the Covenant of *Abraham*, or rather of God in

Christ, even in the New Testament, is clear; for that many were baptized who proved hypocrites and many believed visibly likewise, as *Simon Magus Hymenæus, Alexander, Philetus, &c.* many in all the Churches; and yet these must be accounted the spiritual seed, though most wicked, because they can professe their own present sudden faith: and poor Infants of believers must be accounted the carnal seed, though so long under a Gospel promise; of which you shal not want proof hereafter

Now that all which are baptized, or have any Ordinance, have it administred fundamently on the ground of the Covenant externally administred, I prove thus.

1. God administers all his graces by Covenant, much more outward Ordinances.

2. Souls can have no challenge or interest in God, but by some Covenant or other; *God* is tied to none, but as he ties himself.

3. If there were not a visible and external administration of the Covenant, none should know of the invisible designe of it unto any: all things would be in the dark to us, as to Gods Covenant in a visible dispensation.

4. If this invisible design were not secretly carried on in an outward visible dispensation, there could be none condemned by an outward rule: for who can condemn those who are intentionally, and invisibly in Covenant, or for *Re?* And if every one visibly in Covenant be intentionally

onally and ſpiritually in Covenant, its juſt the ſame.

The whole is this; None are in Covenant (ſay they) but real believers, the ſpiritual ſeed, ſo none to be baptized but ſuch: when it comes to application of the Ordinance, then none are the ſpiritual ſeed but viſible believers, and theſe viſible believers can be judged by no way but by an external profeſſion to be in Covenant; and Infants are no viſible believers, therefore no ſpiritual ſeed; when as the one is as viſible by promiſe, as the other by profeſſion.

CHAP. V.

Opening that place in Acts 2. 39.

Ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν.

THis Text I firſt hold forth as fit to diſcover the New Teſtament application of the Covenant of grace, and its continuation to believers and their ſeed, as to *Abraham* and his in the Old Teſtament: It is the firſt Argument uſed after Chriſts aſcenſion, to provoke the Jews to repent, and ſubmit to Goſpel ordinances; and the firſt open promulgation of the Covenant both to Jew and Gentile, with the prime priviledges of it; in which is contained the Goſpel Covenant made with believers and their ſeed.

1. Here is (ἡ ἐπαγγελία) the promiſe; which can

can be no other then the promiſe of remiſſion of ſins,& ſo of ſalvation;ſutable to that in *Gen.*17.7 and repeated at large in *Jer.*31.34 For it muſt either be a promiſe of temporal things, or ſpiritual;of temporal things it cannot be; for there is no abſolute promiſe of theſe things in the New Teſtament,but as included in, or following ſpiritual mercies, as *Mat.6.33.* Neither is there a ſyllable in this Chapter preſſing men to look after temporal enjoyments,or engaging them to embrace the Goſpel by any outward emoluments.

Ob. The great and only interpretation of this promiſe by theſe that differ, is, that it hath reference to v. 16. and is meant of the promiſe of the holy Ghoſt propheſied of by *Joel Chap.*2.28. which was to be poured forth in the latter daies, and now viſibly and eminently begun to be fulfilled at the day of Pentecoſt.

To which the Anſwer will be clear and fair, though that be granted; and not at all weaken, but ſtrengthen the former ſenſe: For,

1. That promiſe is a ſpiritual promiſe,& more large & comprehenſive of ſpiritual mercies then any other;the promiſe of the ſpirit is as much as to promiſe all at once,graces,gifts,yea Heaven it ſelf,for all are but the fruits of this promiſe;Chriſt in the Old Teſtament,and the Spirit in the New, contain all the promiſes in an eminency. When Jeſus Chriſt was to leave the World,and ſpeak all his heart at once,& leave his laſt bleſſing, that ſhould be

be better then his bodily presence among them, he expresses all in this, that he would send the Spirit *Joh.* 14. 16, 26. *Ch.* 15. 26, 16. 7. And of this larg promise, as well according to Christ's promise before his Ascension, as *Joels* Prophesie, the Apostles and Believers received the first fruits in this solemn day of Christs triumph: So that to say it's the promise of the Spirit, is as much as to say it's the promise of all spiritual things: For this read in *Gal.* 3. 14. the Apostle speaking of the fruits of Christs death, saith, *It was that the blessing of* Abraham *might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith*; The same phrase that is in this 38. *And in the promise of the spirit, which is to be received by faith is included justification, sanctification; yea all graces, and its here joyned with the blessing of* Abraham: But,

2. *If* they take the promise of the Spirit in a limited and restrictive sense, for the external gifts, as the most do, for the gifts of tongues, and miracles, and prophesie, they both clip the promise and make the argument & comfort from it invalid, and of no efficacy.

1. It's a mighty wrong to that famous promise of the Spirit, to circumscribe it in these accidental gifts which were especially necessary, and almost onely for that season: when it's a promise that reacheth all the latter dayes, and is still accomplishing

compliſhing, though all theſe extraordinary gifts are ceaſed.

2. This ſtraitned ſenſe is expunged by the manner of the expreſſions of that Propheſie, both in *Joel*, & this in the *Acts*. *I will pour out of my ſpirit on all fleſh, and on your ſervants and handmaids will I pour out of my ſpirit*: Which ſhews the univerſality and variety of the ſubjects, and bleſſings in this promiſe, that it ſhall be ſo large and full a mercy; as if there were to be no limitation of its meaſure.

3. If it were meant merely of theſe gifts, why then there is no more benefit of that promiſe after the Apoſtles days, but that Chriſt was out of date, and did expire with that age: whereas it is a promiſe made for all the time of the New Teſtament, which is expreſt by the latter days, and the laſt days, up and down the Scripture.

A parallel promiſe to this you have in *Iſa.* 44.3 *I will pour water on him that is thirſty, and floods on the dry ground; I will pour my ſpirit on thy ſeed, and my bleſſing on thy off ſpring*: Now the promiſe of the ſpirit is alwayes appropriated to the New Teſtament days.

And ſecondly, This cannot be the meaning of this phraſe, if we conſider to whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks, *to perſons pricked in their hearts, wounded for their ſins in crucifying of Jeſus Chriſt, crying out*, v. 37. *Men and Brethren, what ſhall we do to be ſaved?* Now what comfort could this be to tell them they

ſhould

ſhould have extraordinary gifts? their hearts were bleeding under ſin, their eye was on ſalvation, they ſaw no hopes of it, nor knew the way to obtain it; the Apoſtle bids them *repent and be baptized*; they might have ſaid, What ſhall we be the better? why (ſaith the Apoſtle) *You ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt; for the promiſe is unto you.* What promiſe? of gifts, of tongues and miracles: What is this to our ſouls? how will this ſave us? might they well object. It would be but a poor comfort to a wounded ſoul for to tell him of a promiſe of gifts, not of ſpiritual grace; and the holy Ghoſt is a better Phyſician than to apply ſuch a raw improper plaiſter to a wounded heart, which would hardly heal the skin: this promiſe is brought in as a cordial, to keep them from fainting, and to give them ſpirits to believe and lay hold on Jeſus Chriſt: And truly no other promiſe but that of free grace, in order to ſalvation, can be imagined to give them comfort in that condition.

But to put all out of queſtion, That the promiſe propheſied of in *Joel*, and quoted here, was the promiſe of ſalvation, and the ſame with the Covenant of Grace, Conſult the Original in *Joel* and the parallel in this of the *Acts*; in *Joel* 2. 27. the Prophet founds all the promiſes that went before, and all that come after, on this, *That he is the Lord their God, and none elſe*; which was the very expreſſe words in that Covenant made with *Abraham*:

Abraham: And then afterwards, *viz.* in the New Teſtament, to make out this fully, *He will pour out his ſpirit on all fleſh, &c.* v.32. which is a part of that propheſie, and is quoted again in v.21. *Whoſoever ſhall call on the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved*; one grace put for all; and ſalvation being put at the end of the promiſe, muſt needs be the aim of it. The ſame expreſſion you have again repeated, *Rom.*10.13.

And in the former v.38.he exhorts them to repent, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, *for the remiſſion of ſin*; the exhortation is to a Goſpel duty; the effect and profit of it was to be remiſſion of ſins, and receiving the gift of the holy Ghoſt; and the promiſe muſt needs be anſwerable, by which all is enforced & it muſt needs have been a mighty low & diſproportionable way of perſwaſion, to put them upon ſuch high things in the former verſe, & to encourage them only by the narration of a promiſe of ſome temporary gifts in the following, when their eye and heart was ſet on remiſſion of ſins, and ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt; and nothing but a promiſe holding forth theſe mercies could have been conſiderable to them.

And it's very obſervable, in that verſe he joyns remiſſion of ſins with the gift of the holy Ghoſt; and then adds the promiſe to both, as the ground of one and the other, and comprehending both: And for that expreſſion of *Receiving the gift of the holy Ghoſt*, it may well be noted, that it is λήψεσθε

ἡ δωρεὰ τῆς πνεύματος ἁγίου the free gift; not τὰ χαρίσματα, the gifts of the holy Spirit; noting the very lending of the Spirit as a free gift to bestow all mercies on them; and so respecting rather the free & bounteous manner of bestowing the holy Ghost on them, then any limited effects of his reception.

By all which it is demonstrated, that this is no ordinary, common, no temporal promise, or of meer gifts, though never so extraordinary, but a promise of free grace.

I onely add this to all the rest, as undeniable by the principles of these that differ; it's a promise made not only to these Jews, but it's universally to the Gentiles, and to all the called of God: but all that are called have not received such gifts of the holy Ghost which then were given; but every one that is effectually called doth receive the promise of remission of sins, and the free saviour of God, and therefore this promise must be taken mainly in that sense.

But the great difficulty is in the following part of the verse, and about the interest of their Children in this promise, and therefore the next work must be to make out this, that the children as well as the Parents are included in this promise, as they were in the promise made with *Abraham*.

1. Let us consider to whom the Apostle speaks to the Jews, who were prickt in their hearts; *The promise is to you and your Children*; He speaks to them

them after the wonted manner of expression in the Old Testament, when ever the promise is mentioned; and useth their own language in which they were trained up in from their Fathers: *I will be the God of thee and thy seed*, Gen. 17. *The promise is to you and your Children*: If the Apostle had intended to exclude their children from the same priviledges they had formerly by the Covenent, he would never have spoken in such a known dialect of the Old Testament: and to Jews, who could take it in no other sense but this, that the promise shall run as formerly, to them and their seed.

2. Let us mind on what ground this is brought in, viz. as an argument and strong inducement of them to repent and be baptized, as in the former verse; *for the promise is to you and your seed*: He encourageth them from this to receive the Ordinance of baptism themselves, for the promise was still the same to them & their Children, only now they must first believe & be baptized themselves, ere their children could be considred in the promise: If the Apostle had not intended to hold forth to them now believing and being baptized, and their Children, the same priviledges they had before as to the promise, it would have been the greatest delusion instead of an argument to perswade them to be baptized on this ground, because the promise was to them and their Children; they had been rather deceived by it, then enlightned

enlightened; and ſtumbled by ſuch a propoſition more then informed of a New Teſtament adminiſtration.

3. Upon what hinge can this Exhortation turn? where is the vertue and ſtrength it hath to move them to be baptized themſelves, but on this conſideration, that they ſhould not only enjoy bleſſings themſelves, through the promiſe, but their Children with them? The promiſe to them was enough for themſelves to ſubmit to that Ordinance: but the height of the enforcement is from the riches of the promiſe, that it was not only to them, but their Children; they might bleſs themſelves & theirs by ſubmitting to the Goſpel; elſe to put in the name of their Children ſpeaking to the Jews, was but to lay a temptation before them, & rather to puzzle them then encourage them: & doubtleſs the Holy Ghoſt would never in the firſt opening of the Goſpel, & encouraging ſouls to embrace it, uſe ſuch a language & expreſſion that might deceive thoſe he ſpake unto: for what could the Jews imagine or conceive upon ſuch a diſcovery, but that if they themſelves did repent and were baptized, the promiſe ſhould be the ſame in the N.T. to them and their Children, as it was formerly to *Abraham*, upon his believing and being circumciſed; to him and his ſeed? there being no expreſſion the Jews were ſo accuſtomed to, & more delighted in, then that of the promiſe to them & their Children: And but to mention their Children with the promiſe,

if it was not meant to hold forth that they were ſtill in the promiſe, was ſufficient to have deceived them, who were never inſtructed in any other method: The great deſign of the Apoſtle was to open the N.T. promiſe, & by that to encourage the poor wounded Jews to repent & be baptized: and that they might have no cloud on their apprehenſions, or diſcouragement, he utters it in *lingua vernacula*, in the phraſe the promiſe was alwayes expreſt in the Old Teſtament.

4. If the intent of the Apoſtle were not to hold forth the ſameneſs & identity of the priviledge of the promiſe to the Jews & Gentiles now believing, as was formerly; he would never have mentioned Children when he mentions Baptiſm, & eſpecially not in the ſame line with the promiſe made to the Parents; & with one breath expreſs the promiſe to both, & make that the ſtrength of his argument to put them on the practice of that Ordinance: And doubtles it had not bin ſo candid away, nor ſutable to the ſimplicity of the Goſpel, to tel them of their Children, juſt when he tels them of being baptized themſelves; & name them immediatly with the promiſe, if the deſign was utterly to exclude them both from the promiſe & Baptiſm. I have been the longer inculcating theſe conſidrations, becauſe there is much in them, & engaged perſons can ſlightly paſs over the moſt eminent places with a meer glance.

Ob. But it's objected, That the latter clauſe, (ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν) *As many as the Lord ſhall*

ſhall call, is a limitation of the verſe, & no more are under the promiſe; and ſo Children, if God ſhall call them, ſhall alſo enjoy the promiſe.

Sol. For anſwer to this laſt objection, which is the ſtrength of their confidence from this place, we muſt conſider theſe particulars.

1. That in this verſe you have an exact diſtribution of the world into Jew and Gentile, according to the uſual diſtribution in other Scriptures; the Gentiles being uſually called theſe *afar off*; and the promiſe equally diſtributed among; onely he adds (*as many as the Lord ſhall call*) to theſe which are afar, as moſt proper in that place: but it can in no ſenſe be referred to the former part of the verſe, either to Parents or children: For,

1. He changes the tenſe in both parts of the verſ. in the firſt part unto the Jews, he ſpeaks *de præſenti*, of the preſent application of the promiſe; *Repent you, and be baptized——for the promiſe is to you and your Children*; even now the promiſe is offered to you & they were then under the call of God: But when he ſpeaks of the Gentiles, becauſe they were yet afar off, & not at all called, he ſpeaks *de futuro*, as many as God ſhall call, even of them alſo; which is the firſt expreſs hint of the calling of the Gentiles in all the Acts of the Apoſtles.

2. How unequal would the diſtribution be of this verſe, not ſutable to the laws of expreſſion among rational men? If *As many as the Lord ſhall call* ſhould be a limitation to the former part of the verſe,

the word *Children*, muſt needs be redundant and ſuperfluous; for Jews and Gentiles comprehend all the world. Now Children muſt either be one part of the world, or comprehended under one or both names, or be a diſtinct world by themſelves, neither Jews nor Gentiles: And this muſt needs follow on ſuch a reading of the words; for the deſign of the Apoſtle is to hold forth the freeneſs of the promiſe to Jew and Gentile, & their Children; to theſe Jews at preſent, to the Gentiles and their Children when God ſhould call the Parents, as he did theſe Jews. Now put Children by themſelves, as a third party, and add *whom the Lord ſhall call*, & you exclude them from being either Jews or Gentiles, & ſo excommunicate them from any hopes of calling or being ſaved: Now this is,

1. Contrary to that known rule in Logick, That *Omnis bona diſtributio debet eſſe bimembris*; only of two members, and theſe oppoſite one to another; to bring in a third mars all. So that it is moſt clear, the words muſt be underſtood, as they are tranſlated; The promiſe is to you Jewes, and your Children at preſent, and to thoſe afar off alſo, and their Children, when God ſhall *call them*, elſe *calling* can with no ſenſe be applied to any tittle of the former part of the verſe, without you make it monſtrous, and unlike it ſelf.

2. It's againſt another rule about diſtribution, which is, That *Partes diviſionis ambulent æquali paſſu*; That the parts of a diſtribution ſhould be equally

ſet

ſet together. Now here will be a mighty inequality, as to the communication of the promiſe; if the words ſhould be taken in their ſenſe, the Jews will have a greater priviledge then the Gentiles, if Children be not equally added to both; the Jews had the promiſe made to them and their Children at preſent; theſe afar off ſhall only have the promiſe to themſelves, but not their Children.

3. Conſider how comes this word (*your Children*) to be kept in, for what end and uſe, if it were not to ſhew ſome ſpecial priviledge they have with their Parents, when God cals or converts the Parents? what ſtands it for but a ſtone of offence to conſcientious hearts?

OBJECTION.

All they anſwer to this, is, that the Apoſtle names their Children to comfort their parents, becauſe they had wiſhed Chriſts blood on their Children, and ſo to give them hopes they might yet be ſaved, if God ſhould call them.

SOLUTION.

To ſee the ſaid ſhifts of errour, is wonderfull: Can any man imagine, that the Parents could doubt more, or ſo much of their Childrens being accepted & ſaved, when God ſhould call them who were innocent, & only under the ſudden raſh curſe of their Parents, when they ſaw that the promiſe was to themſelves, & Chriſt offered pardon to themſelves, who were the actuall murtherers of the Lord Jeſus.

2. Such a conſideration would, rather ſadden them then refreſh them, to mention the calling of their Children: For they might more doubt of that then of any thing, whether God would call them or no, & be as far to ſeek as ever they were that they would have but cold comfort upon this account; this was enough to break their hearts if that were in their eye; the old way of conveying the promiſe is cut off, no promiſe but to *called* ones; our poor Children are uncalled, & God knows whether ever they may be called of God: Thus might they reaſon: But when he includes them in the ſame promiſe with Parents, & exhorts the Parents to repent, upon this ground, that the promiſe is to them & their Children; this ſavours like a Goſpel comforting-exhortation, and could not be but of great efficacy upon their ſpirits.

4. What ſtrange myſterious tautologies would be in this one verſe? if that laſt ſentence ſhould refer to all the former *expreſſions*, we muſt read it thus to make out their ſenſe.

The promiſe is to you Parents of the Jews, when God ſhall call you (and they were then under the call) and to you grown Children, when God ſhall call them; and to all which are afar off, when God ſhall call them: Can any man with his underſtanding about *him* think the Holy Ghoſt ſhould faulter ſo much in common expreſſion of his mind, when there was no need of adding or calling to any part, but to theſe that were afar off,

who

who were never yet under Gods Gospel call?

Lastly, the word, Children, may and must be understood of Little Ones, Infants, not of adult and grown persons, for these reasons,

1. The word here (τεκνοῖς) properly signifies an off-spring, any thing brought forth, though it be but of a day, of a moment old: Thus when a woman is said to be in pain, and to bring forth, this word is used, *John* 16.21. *Luke* 1.31. *Mat.* 1.26. *Luke* 1.57.

2. It's an indefinite word, and therefore may not be restrained to grown Children, except God had expresst it in a peculiar phrase.

3. It must needs be especially meant of Little Ones because they are distinguished from themselves, who were men of years. Now when we distinguish between Men & Children, we suppose the one adult, the other under age, & not grown up; & it is contrary to all ways of expression to think otherwise

4. It cannot be rationally conjectured otherwise, because the Apostle doth joyn them with their Parents in the same promise, and not leave them to stand by themselves, as grown persons must.

So that all things weighed, this Text of Scripture, if there were no more, holds forth the sameness of the promise to Believers of the Gospel, both Jew and Gentile, and their Children, as ever it was to *Abraham*, and his natural seed.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Their great plea from Mat. 3.8.9. *concerning* John *the Baptiſt's Speeches to the Phariſees and Sadduces, made vain, and that Text cleared from miſtakes.*

THAT we may ſtill take of the main Objections, let us view that place ſo much ſtood on, *Mat.* 3,7.8,9. *When* John *ſaw many of the Phariſees and Sadduces come to his baptiſm, he ſaith, O generation of Vipers, who hath forwarned you to flee from the wrath to come? bring forth fruits meet for repentance: And think not to ſay within your ſelves we have* Abraham *to our Father; for I ſay that God is able of theſe ſtones to raiſe up Children to* Abraham: From this Text they gather, that the pretence of being *Abraham* Children could not give them a right to Baptiſm; and if *John* denied *Abraham* natural ſeed on that account, much more would he the adopted Children.

That this is no ſuch ominous place againſt Infant Baptiſm, Conſider,

1. Who they were he ſpeaks unto, the Phariſees and Sadduces, men at age, and degenerated from *Abrahams* faith, perſons that live on their own works and righteouſneſs; therefore he calls them γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, *A generation of Vipers*; which was not as they were *Abrahams* Children, but as they had not walked in *Abrahams* ſteps, but were quite

quite degenerated: Thus he did not refuse them because *Abraham* was their Father, or upon that account that *Abraham* seed had not right to the promise; but as only pretending *Abraham* to be their Father, when they walkt contrary to the principles of *Abrahams* faith.

2. That is the same now as to grown visible professors, who have related their faith to the Church, and so are baptized upon that account of faith, & repentance: yet if afterwards they grow carnal & apostate, and if such should come to receive the Lords Supper, and challenge it because they are baptized, we might say the same as *John* to the Pharisees & Sadduces: Do not think to say that you are baptised, or that you have had godly Parents; for you are a generation of Vipers, you have cut off your own right by contrary actings in your own persons; & yet it doth nothing at all impeach the truth of this position. That Believers and their *Infants* are in Covenant, & ought to be judged so until they manifest the contrary; or that if they believed themselves afterward, the promise shou'd not be unto them & their Children: And that Text holds not no more then this, That when persons are grown up to years, & come to understanding, they must then stand on their right & look to make out personal qualifications of new Ordinances.

3. This was at the first institution of the Ordinance, when Baptism was newly administred: Now new institutions (as before) require grown persons

ſons, and actuall viſible believers to be the firſt ſubject of them; they could not baptize their Children firſt; for then the Parents would be neglected; & the bringing in of a new Ordinance requires renewing of ſpecial acts in theſe which partake firſt of it; as if an old *Leaſe* which is made in the name of a man & his Children, be at ſuch a ſeaſon to be renewed upon ſome certain terms, the man himſelf muſt come, & acknowledge his owning theſe terms, & then it is to him & his, as before: So now in the New Teſtament God renews the Covenant of *Abraham*, adds a new initiating ſeal to it; it was before entail'd in ſuch a line, which is cut off; it's now of the ſame nature, only every one muſt come in his own perſon firſt, as *Abraham*, and enter his own name, & then the promiſe is to him & his ſeed: Thus it was in the former place, where when the Jews came to be baptized, they were exhorted firſt to repent and be baptized themſelves; then the *promiſe is to you and your Children*: So that this we affirm,

1. That no man muſt be baptized, or receive an Ordinance by any fleſhly prerogative; but where there is an entail of a promiſe, there is a ſpiritual ground of adminiſtration.

2. That no perſon grown up to years of underſtanding, hath right to a ſealing Ordinance, but upon his own perſonal qualifications.

3. That perſons may have preſent capacities, & viſible right to Ordinances, and yet afterwards cut off

off themſelves, and be found incapable, as *Iſhmael* and here the Phariſees and Sadduces.

4. That the exception of ſome perſons upon the account of their degeneration, & perſonal defects, doth not hinder, but the old priviledge of the promiſe may be conveyed to theſe which do really embrace the Goſpel, and to their ſeed; all theſe are undeniable in themſelves: And this Text reacheth no further then to the excluſion of theſe which had demonſtrated themſelves to be only the Children of the fleſh, & not of the promiſe alſo: which is a demonſtration only *à poſteriori*, from their after actings: & teacheth us that theſe that boaſt in outward priviledges, without looking after perſonal qualifications, & holy frames within, may be as well judged carnal, as Heathens & prophane perſons.

CHAP. VII.

That ſpecial place in 1 Cor. 7. 14. *opened, and argument*; Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.

THIS place of Scripture, though it ſeems to ſtand by it ſelf, yet hath full correſpondence and harmony with all other places in the N. T. concerning this truth. As the former did hold forth the promiſe, the Covenant to Believers and their Children, in diſtinction from all the world: ſo doth this leave a character of ſpecial qualifications ſutable to a ſubject of ſuch an Ordinance and

and when the promiſe and the qualification ſhall meet together, there is enough for to capacitate to any Ordinance.

The Apoſtle is in this verſe anſwering a ſcruple which might ariſe in the hearts of the *Corinthians* concerning abiding together of married perſons; the one being a Convert, and a Believer; the other, whether man or woman, an Unbeliever; as it was a common caſe in the Apoſtles times, the Husband might be converted, the Wife not; and the Wife converted, and not the Husband; the Word working on the one, not on the other; this begat a doubt in the believing Party, whether he or ſhe might with a good conſcience live together in that ſtate.

The Apoſtle anſwers it, ver. 12,13. poſitively That they ought not to ſeparate, or leave each other, notwithſtanding that the one was an Unbeliever: And he gives in this ver. 14. a ſtrong and peculiar argument, which he makes *inſtar omnium*; for the unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in the believing Wife, &c. *Elſe were your Children unclean, but now they are holy.*

The ſcope of the Apoſtle here is to hold forth ſome ſpecial Goſpel-priviledge annexed to the *ſtate:* and he frames his argument by no ordinary medium, of the lawfulneſſe of the marriage according to a natural or poſitive rule, but *à majori*, from an eminent advantage they had together in the Goſpel: For,

1. The

1. The unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in, or, to, or by the Wife.

2. The Children in ſuch a ſtate are holy, as if they had been both believers.

That the Apoſtle holds out a Goſpel-priviledge, not common to meer unbelievers in their marriage ſtate, is clear;

1. Becauſe the Apoſtle puts the advantage on the believers ſide, and there fixeth it; the unbelieving Husband is ſanctified in the Wife, as believing; and ſo contrarily, the unbelieving Wife in the Husband: So *Beza* affirms that in two ſpecial Copies he finds the words thus read, ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ πίστει, ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ πίστῳ. neither can it hold ſenſe with the former words but as thus read: And if it had not been the Apoſtles proper meaning to ſhew the ſpecial priviledge the believing party hath notwithſtanding the unbeliever, he would have only ſaid, the Husband is ſanctified to the Wife, and the Wife to the Husband; that would have been the plaineſt and leaſt ambitious expreſſion of ſuch a ſentence: and the Apoſtle would never have made an argument of four terms, when three could only ſatisfie; for all know, that an argument with four terms is moſt deceitful and falſe.

2. The Apoſtle doth uſe higher terms & phraſes in this argument, then is ever uſed in Scripture to expreſs a meer lawful or common priviledge, as to be ſanctified in the Wife, & the Children to be holy; expreſſions of another dialect then to hold forth a civil

civil, or natural, or legal conjunction; being singled out in Scripture, to hold forth the best state of persons and things, in relation to God and his use.

And the Apostle useth two terms, both negative and affirmative; *they are not unclean, but holy*; the opening of the use of which two words will clear the point under consideration.

The word here (ἀκάθαρτα) *unclean*, in the Old Testament, is commonly used for those legal pollutions and uncleannesses which made men to be separated from the Congregation, and excommunicated from the priviledge of Ordinances, untill they were washed and sanctified; Thus in *Lev.* 5. 2. 3, 4 *Chap.* 7. 19. & 14. 7, 8. *Isa.* 52. 1. *Hag.* 2. 13. with many other places, where *unclean* is opposed to a present futable capacity for Church priviledges; But that famous place in *Act.* 10. 14. shews it most clear, what the proper use of this word is; he joyns it there with what is common or prophane: When the vision came to him of eating all sorts of Creatures, he saith, *Not so Lord; for I have not eaten any thing that is common or unclean* (ἀκάθαρτον) This vision was about his going to *Cornelius* to open the Gospel to him, and bring him into the Church who was a Gentile, and so common & unclean, not fit for Gospel-priviledges, as the Jews were thought to be. Now in a civil sense things that are common are not unclean; but in a religious sense, what is common is adjudged unclean; Now *Cornelius* being a Gentile, without the pale of the Jewish Church, he

cals

cals him common and unclean, as all the Gentiles were before they came under the promiſe: but God anſwered, *What God hath clenſed*, or ſanctified, *call not thou common: Cornelius* was not a Baſtard nor unlawfully begotten; but he was not accounted a fit member, he was without the Church; therefore the Apoſtle cals him common and unclean: Juſt in the ſame phraſe with the Apoſtle here, when he ſaith that children are not unclean, he muſt needs mean they are not of common uſe, or to be excluded from outward priviledges of the Church: But that is not all, but he poſitively ſaith, they are (*holy*) ἅγια not only ἀκαθαρτα, *not unclean*: And this latter word is moſt uſed to expreſſe the Hebrew word קדש, which ever ſignifies what is *uſui Divino accommodatum*, that which is appropriated to a Divine uſe; which is the proper notion of holineſs in the Old & New Teſtament, and never taken otherwiſe: For the proof of which, I have compared above three hundred places in the Old Teſtament according to the Septuagint, and all the N. Teſt places where the word is uſed. And this all do grant, even Mr. *Tombes* himſelf, that the word generally is taken in ſcripture to expreſs a ſeparation of things to God, & he only brings theſe places wherein he thinks there is another uſe of it. 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. *Every Creature of God is good, and not to be refuſed, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is ſanctified by the Word and Prayer* (ἁγιάζεται) *Hence* ſaith he, *is meant onely the lawfull uſe of the Creature, in oppoſition to what is to be refuſed.* It is a wonder, but

but that God leaves men to blindneſs when they leave truth, how any man of common underſtanding, finding the Word *holy* & *ſanctified*, always uſed in a religious ſenſe, ſhould fly to this place to make an exception. The Apoſtle ſaith firſt, *Every Creature which God hath made is good in it ſelf, and none to be refuſed*: that is, all may be lawfully uſed without any legal pollution, as formerly: But then he goes higher, ſpeaking of a religious uſe of outward things; *They are ſanctified by the Word and Prayer; they are all good, and lawful in their uſe to every man: but they are onely ſanctified by theſe holy means, the Word and Prayer*. And he might have as well ſaid, that the Word and Prayer are not holy means, but only lawful to be uſed, as that the ſanctification which is by the Word and Prayer; is to make the Creatures only lawful to be uſed. If a wicked man eat his meat without ſeeking a bleſſing on it, or giving thanks, will any one ſay that he hath not a lawfull uſe of the Creature? but any man may ſay, it's not ſanctified to him. The Apoſtle in theſe 2. ver. goes on *gradatim*, by degrees, from a lawful uſe to a holy uſe of the Creatures; *All is good and may be uſed, but they are ſanctified by the Word and Prayer:* thus you ſee the nature of this priviledged place.

But the main place Mr. *Tombes* alledgeth for holineſs to be uſed for what is barely civil or lawful, is that 1 *Theſ.* 4 3,4,7. *This is the will of God, your ſanctification, that you abſtain from fornication, and let every*

every one poſſeſs his veſſel in ſanctification and honor; for God hath not called us to uncleanneſs, but holineſſe. Here uncleanneſſe is taken, ſaith he, *for fornication, and holineſſe for chaſtity.*

To which I anſwer with Mr. *Marſhal*, That chaſtity among the Heathens is never called ſanctification, but among Believers it is, being a part of the new Creation, & one branch and part of their ſanctification, wrought by the Spirit of God. And though Mr. *Tombes* ſaith this is but a ſhift, yet he ſhall ſee it demonſtrative, if he obſerve the phraſes in the Text, and the nature of ſanctification; in the 1, & 2. ver. the Apoſtle beſeecheth & exhorteth them *to walk as they had received from him how to walk, and to pleaſe God according to the rules of Jeſus Chriſt*; and he urgeth it in ver. the 3. with this; *It's the will of God, even your ſanctification, that is, that you ſhould walk in all holineſſe, ſutable to the bleſſed rules of the Goſpel*, and as one part and expreſſion of holineſſe, to abſtain from ſin: And he inſtanceth ſpecially in fornication, which was the common and reigning ſin among the Gentiles: So that if you view the place you ſhall find, That,

1. He ſpeaks of ſanctification in general, in its ful latitude, ver. 3. as ſutable to all the will and mind of God; *This is the will of God, even your ſanctification*; that is, it is Gods command, & Gods delight to ſee you ſanctified: then he brings in abſtinence from fornication (the ſin of the times) as one part of that holineſſe God requires: For ſanctification may

be considered, as it lies in vivification, or in mortification, which for distinctions sake we may call the two parts of sanctification. Now chastity in it self, as in the Heathens & natural men, is not properly a part of sanctification; some other Epithite becomes it better: Would Mr. *Tombs* call all the abstinencies and actings of the Heathens by the name of sanctifications, and speak like a Christian and a Divine? Would it be proper to say in his Pulpit (when he was speaking of the nature of holiness and chastity) sanctified *Socrates*, holy *Aristides*? And can he think the Apostle would expresse that which is common among Heathens, in such a high Gospel-dialect, as sanctification is appropriated alwayes in Scripture to God, Angels, Saints, and their highest graces and workings, and to things raised above common use, dedicated to God and his service, but that he meant it according as the whole tenure of scripture defines holiness? How much will the phrase of holiness and sanctification be debased and made common, if that sense should be admitted, contrary to the Scripture-use of the Word? But that is a weak case that puts men to such extraordinary shifts to maintain.

But to go on a little further; The same word is used by the Apostle in all his salutations, & inscriptions of his Epistles to all the Churches, *τοῖς ἁγίοις, to the Saints* or holy ones at *Rome*, at *Corinth*, *Galatia*, *Ephesus*, *&c.* which when appropriated to persons, alwayes signifies a visible Saint:

So

So here, when he calls Children of believing Parents holy, he cannot but mean they are to be accounted as visible *Saints*, untill they do profess the contrary; and I know no reason can be given why the meaning of the Apostle in his Epistle, when he writes τοῖς ἁγίοις, *to the Saints*, should not be as well understood written onely to the legitimate, and those that are not bastards at *Rome*, *Corinth*, *&c.* as well as for them to interpret the same word so in this place: For ἅγιοι, when applyed to grown men, must signifie visible and Evangelical holinesse; and must be translated Saints: but when applied to Children, it must only signifie legitimacy, that they are not *Bastards*, when all men know, that *magis & minus non variant speciem*; and the word is of the same import in every place of the New Testament.

Ob. If any shall be so critical as Mr *Tombes* is, to enquire how they can be said to be holy: what holinesse is here meant, whether inherent, or imputative, or visible?

Sol. I answer, It's a holiness of special separation to God, & his use, as a peculiar people: Some call it a federal holines, from the ground of the priviledg: others an Ecclesiastical, or Church holines, from the account & esteem the Church ought to have of such Children: but the first more fully answers the largest use of the word in Scripture. As for Infants.

1. They are capable of inherent holinesse.
2. They are in Covenant, as we have proved,

and ſo have a holy relation on them.

3. They are capable of ſeparation to Gods uſe from the womb, and ſo of being holy to God.

4. By the ſame reaſon we account grown men holy, we may account Infants of believers holy; for theſe that make a profeſſion may have no inward & inherent holineſſe; and a bare profeſſion is not holineſſe; we only account them holy by a judicious charity; and we are often deceived, and have cauſe to repent of our judgements: Infants may be inwardly ſanctified, and God hath taken them into the Covenant with their Parents, & would have us look on them as ſeparated to himſelf; which is ground enow to build our charity on, as to eſteem them holy, as grown perſons. There is no difference but this in it; That concerning the holineſſe of perſons at age, we truſt our own judgements, & in judging of Infants we truſt Gods Word, who had comprehended them under the promiſe with their Parents; there had been as many deceits in the event, in our judgement of thoſe of riper years, as in that which is acted through a mixture of faith & charity on Infants. And Gods promiſe, though never ſo indefinit, is a ſurer ground for hope, than my probable judgement; which is the moſt I can have of the generality of Profeſſors of riper years.

Q. But if any one ſay further, What is this to Baptiſm? here is no mention of it in this place.

Sol. It's true, baptiſm is not mentioned here; but here is mention of a qualified ſubject for Baptiſm,

tiſm, which is all that is contended for. And if the Apoſtle had ſaid they were believers, then theſe of the contrary opinion would conclude, here is enough for Baptiſm; but its all one, in that he calls them holy, which you ſee is more than legitimate; and you may tranſlate it with as much propriety, *Elſe were your Children impure, but now they are Saints*; that is, ſo to be eſteemed through Gods Covenant, as if they had profeſſed their own faith.

Laſtly, as it would be moſt abſurd to imagine the Apoſtle ſhould uſe a pure religious word to expreſs a common & ordinary priviledge: ſo there would be no conſiderable *medium* for augmentation in that ſenſe, & no ſuch force in ἐπεὶ ἄρα (*elſe were, &c.*) which hath force from the ſpecialneſs of the priviledge to their iſſue, not only to be lawfully begotten, as the Children of unbelievers are, when lawfully married. but, to be in a peculiar ſtate of ſeparation to God, and to be accounted fit members with the believing Parent of the viſible Church of Chriſt.

And what a poor & cold anſwer, as to comfort, would it be, when the believer was ſcrupled about abiding with his or her unbelieving yoke-fellow, to tell them, Continue together; for your Children ſhall not be Baſtards: but how full of ſtrength and ſweetneſs muſt it be, if taken in the contrary ſenſe, Remaine with your yoke fellows, though unbelievers; they are ſanctified to you, & you ſhall notwithſtanding bring forth a holy ſeed; a ſeed of God,

as the old Teſtament expreſſion; in Covenant, as if you were both believers: this ſounds like a *medium* moſt demonſtrative and conſolatory, both for ſatisfaction & comfort: What plainer teſtimony, or fairer character can be written to ſhew the qualification of Infants of believers, than to write them holy, & give them the ſame name that is given to Chriſt, and Saints in Heaven and Earth?

CHAP. VIII.

The Harmonie that notable Chapter, Rom. 11. *hath with the former Scriptures; the* 15, 16, 17, *verſes eſpecially opened.*

THAT the Adverſaries of this truth may ſee we want not a harmonie of Scriptures to confirm our judgement, the next place to be conſidered of is that, *Rom.* 11. eſpecially ver. 15, 16, 17 of that Chapter; which if well weighed, will demonſtrate the holineſſe and Church-membership of the Children of believing Gentiles, as much as of the Jews Children that deſcended naturally from *Abraham.*

The ſcope of the whole Chapter is to diſcover the breaking off, or caſting away of the Jewiſh Nation from being a Church, and the priviledge the Gentiles get by this, & their ingraffing into the ſame root; and the promiſe of the reſtauration of the

the Jews again, when the fulneſs of the Gentiles ſhould come in, and every one of theſe expreſt with variety of notions, & interlined with many cautions concerning Gods actings in this great diſpenſation. Concerning the full explication of this Chapter, Mr, *Cobbet* and Mr. *Baxter* have done worthily, and have with much clearneſſe argued for Infants Church-memberſhip from it. I ſhall onely for methods ſake, and your ſatisfaction, open the main and moſt controverted terms in this Chapter concerning this ſubject. As,

1. What this breaking off, or caſting away of the Jews imports, and from what they are broken off; from the viſible or inviſible Church, v. 15.

2. What is meant by the firſt-fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches; and how it can be affirmed; that if the root be holy, ſo are the branches, v. 16.

3. What this ingraffing is, and how the gentiles are ſaid to be ingraffed, and to be partakers of the fatneſſe of the Olive, v. 17. For the firſt, This caſting off, and breaking off, is not from the inviſible, but the viſible Church.

1. This will maintain falling away from grace, and pleaſe the Arminians, the great Enemies of the Goſpel of free grace: but this the Apoſtle prevents ver. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. by anticipation of that Objection, diſtinguiſhing the Elect, and himſelf as one of them from being caſt off: *I ſay then, hath God caſt away his people whom he foreknew? God forbid. I alſo am an Iſraelite,*

Iſraelite, &c. If the caſting off meant here was from the inviſible Church, then *Paul* and the other Elect among the Jews were caſt off from that Church; but *God forbid*, ſaith *Paul*, v. 5. there is a remnant at this preſent time according to the election of grace, whereof *Paul* was one; therefore it muſt be from the viſible Church they were broken off: But here the *Arminians* and *Pelagians* agree with theſe that are againſt Infant-baptiſm, as they do in many other opinions. Mr *Tombes* hath nothing to ſay in his *Examen* of Mr. *Marſhals* Sermon, to avoid this abſurdity, but only this, pag. 64.

The meaning is not (ſaith he) *of ſome of the branches in the inviſible Church; but as when our Saviour Chriſt uſing the ſame ſimilitude, ſays*, Joh. 15. 2. Every branch in me not bearing fruit, he taketh away: *The meaning is, not that any branch in him could be fruitleſs, or taken away; but he calleth that a branch in him, which was ſo in appearance: ſo the Apoſtle ſpeaking of branches broken off, means it not of ſuch as were truly ſo, but ſo in appearance.* Thus far he.

Which is a granting of what he denies; for to be a branch in appearance, is only to be a viſible branch; and no branch that is meerly in appearance ſo, and not really, is one of the inviſible Church, nor can ever be ſaid to be broken from it, but only from his viſible ſtate which he hath, but (ὡς κλῆμα) v. 15, 16. as a branch in outward priviledges, and ſeeming graces.

2. The breaking off, &c. it was of the Jewiſh Nation

Nation, of the collective body, though not of every individual, and therefore it must needs be from the visible Church; for as a nation they were a church, and the whole Nation was cast away and rejected; now as a Nation they were not all members of the invisible Church, ver. 7,8. with ver. 17.

3. Its a visible breaking off, therefore cannot be from the invisible Church, ver. 3,4,5. 17,18,19. For as Mr *Baxter* well observes, *There can be no visible removing from an invisible term.*

4. Its a breaking off the natural branches, so he cals the Jews: Now the body of the Jewish Church were not natural branches in a spirituall sense; for they believed not as *Abraham* did; but onely called so as they were naturally descended from his loyns, & were members of the visible Church, & first partakers of the outward priviledges of the Covenant made with him: Thus the Apostle distinguisheth of the body of the Jewish Nation, *Rom. 9.* where after he had reckoned up all the priviledges of the Israelites in general, v. 4. *Who are Israelites, to whom pertains the adoption & the glory, & the Covenants? &c,* making way by this to shew the sadness of their rejection, in v. 6. To prevent the same Objection, the Apostle in this Chapter. saith, *They are not all* Israel *which are of* Israel; that is, not all spiritual, though all natural branches; & these priviledges did visibly belong to all. As for that distinction of *Abrahams* being a natural & a spirittal Father, it may go for currant until they come to apply it, and then it is

most

moſt vain; for all that came from *Abraham* as a naturalFather, had a title to all theſe priviledges forementioned, which belonged to the viſible Church until they did degenerate, and caſt themſelves out, as *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*, &c. But of this formerly.

Laſtly, if they were broken off from the inviſible Church, it muſt be either from union with Chriſt, or communion with Chriſt and his Spirit; for this is the true definition of the inviſible Church, that in it ſouls have reall union and communion with God in Chriſt through the Spirit: but none of the Jews that were broken off had ſuch a union or communion, and therefore could not be broken off from it: But ſo far they may be ſaid to be broken off from the inviſible Church, as by remote conſequence, as they were excluded from all the meanes of grace, and the Ordinances; which are the uſual ways and methods of God to bring ſouls into communion with himſelf.

2. Let us conſider what is meant by the firſt-fruits, and the lump, and the root, and the branches: There be many opinions concerning this, eſpecially two muſt be debated; ſome think it Chriſt, as thoſe that follow *Origen*, and the allegorical Fathers: But that firſtly and primarily by the firſt-fruits and the lump and the root, and the branches, cannot be meant Chriſt neither perſonally nor myſtically, is moſt clear if we conſider,

Ego aliam ſanctam radicem neſcio, niſi Dominum noſtrum. Orig.

1. Jeſus

1. Jesus Christ was not the first-fruits in regard of the whole lump of the Jewish Nation, and so cannot answer to the first similitude.

2. Jesus Christ cannot be said to be root unto these which were cast away; no branches really in him are cut off, but so were they; for that place of the 15. of *John*, ver. 2. which seemeth to speak of some branches which are in Christ, and yet are taken away for not bearing fruit: it may be better read, and according to the *Syriak*, thus; *every branch that brings not forth fruit in me, he takes away*; that is, that do bring forth some seeming fruit, but not as in Christ, as root and principle.

3. In ver. 24. the Jews when they shall be called, its said, *They shall be graffed into their own Olive*: Now Christ is not properly their own Olive, but so is *Abraham*, &c.

4. The Jews are said (as formerly) to be natural branches of this root, but so they were not of Christ; but Christ was a natural branch from that stock, *Rom.* 9.5. *Whose are the Fathers; of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came.*

Mr. *Tombes* himself ingenuously confesseth this, page 67. of his *Examen*, *That by the root cannot be meant Christ*; and gives us the hint of another argument from those expressions, v. 24. of some branches, wild κατὰ φύσιν, *according to nature*; and of ingraffing in, παρὰ φύσιν *contrary to nature*, into this Olive; he concludes the root cannot be Christ: for Christ hath no natural or preternatural branches in him;

him;all are wild ere they be ingraffed into him as a living root:And the other expreſſion, v. 18. of our not bearing the root,but the root us,if we boſt againſt the Jews,doth evidently demonſtrate, that the root here is not properly meant of Chriſt, though he be the eternal root of all ſpiritual happineſſe, ſet forth glorioufly in many other places of Scripture.

Others by the root mean the Covenant: But the beſt and moſt genuine ſenſe is to interpret it of *Abraham*, with whom,and with his ſeed, as ſo many branches,the Covenant was made, and by which both the root and the branches were made holy: And this anſwers fully to both the ſimilitudes.For

1. It's an alluſion to the Legal rights about the firſt-fruits which,were to be offered up to God; and by that all the whole maſs, all the fruitsthat came after were accounted holy: Thus *Abraham* was the firſt-fruits of the Jews: he believing firſt, and being in Covenant, all the lump, the whole body of the Jewiſh Nation were taken in to be a Church, and were accounted holy.

2. As a root it anſwers to him from whom all the Jews ſprang up,and from whom they drew all their Church-priviledges,as their breath:Thus the Lord by the Prophet in *Iſa.*51.1,2. bids the Jews to *look to the rock out of which they were hewen, and the pit out of which they were digged:* he meanes it of *Abraham* firſt, as appears by the ſecond verſe; *Look to* Abraham *your Father, and to* Sarah *that bare you;*

for

for I called him alone, and bleſſed & increaſed him, &c.

Ob. But what kind of conſequence is this? and how doth the Apoſtle make uſe of this? *If the firſt-fruits be holy, ſo is the lump; and if the root be holy, ſo are the branches:* From what principle doth the Apoſtle argue?

Sol. The Apoſtle in the former verſe ſpeaks of a receiving in again of the Jewiſh Nation, & brings in this as a ground to hope for it. *There is yet a holy root which hath an influence on the branches; and argues, that if the root be holy, when the branches broken off ſhall be re-ingraffed, they ſhall be holy likewiſe.* The like phraſe you have in v. 28. *As touching the Goſpel they are enemies for your ſake; but as touching the Election, they are beloved, διὰ τοὺς πατέρας, for their Fathers ſake; God having ſo caſt his election, as to run in that vein moſt eminently:* And ſome do render it, *They are beloved through their* Fathers: But this is clear;

1. That *Abraham*, or as ſome ſay, *Abraham Iſaac* and *Jacob* were the root.

2. That he argues from the holineſſe of the root to the holineſſe of the branches: that is, from them as Parents to their poſterity as Branches.

3. That this was an uſual and common principle of arguing in Scripture, from the Parent to the Poſterity; for elſe he had ſpoken in the dark, & had proved *notum per ignotius*, if they could not univerſally reaſon from it, & if you obſerve, he writes is as an Axiom of the greateſt demonſtration, and never

never ſtands to prove it further.

4. It had been an argument of no force for to prove the calling in of the Jews, and their happy ſtate upon re-ingraffing, to tell them, *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches; and they are beloved for the Fathers ſake*, if there were not a virtue ſtill in the root to derive holineſſe to them, when they ſhould be received in, and ingraffed to their own Olive; he lays all the weight on the root; being ſtill holy and freſh, though the branches be broken off. And what can you make of this as to argumentation? *If the root be holy*, Ergo *the branches*; and apply it to Perſons, and Parents, but in a moral and imputative conſideration.

Ob. But holineſſe is not propagated by nature, from the parent to his Child; and we all derive ſin by nature from our Parents; and are, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Eph.* 2. 2. *by nature the Children of wrath, &c.* and as *David* ſaith, *Conceived in ſin.*

Sol. 1. It's true, we are ſo; and there is no holineſſe propagated by nature, take it for internal habits; as a wiſe man doth not convey his wiſdom, or a vertuous man his vertue to his Child, neither can a Believer convey his faith and other graces to his Child; and in this ſenſe *Abraham* is not a root, he begets no believer; and under this conſideration the argument cannot hold; *Abraham* in this ſenſe is onely a root, παραδειγματικῶς, *exemplary only*; Chriſt is ἐνεργετικῶς, *effectually, to convey ſimilar graces*: But,

2. There

2. There is a holineſſe by gratious eſtimation or imputation, which flows from Gods Covenant, or ſome ſpecial priviledge given to ſuch a ſtock, or kindred, or Nation; God taking ſuch a family, ſuch a ſtock, and ſeparates it to himſelf for ſome holy uſe, and ſo bleſſeth them: And thus it was with *Abraham*, and is moſt common in the Scriptures, and according to the nature of priviledges among men, where the ſon of a freeman is free, & the ſon of a Nobleman a Nobleman; & by way of alluſion, (though it doth not hold in all particulars) as in juſtification, Chriſts righteouſneſſe is imputed, & we accounted holy by it: So as to ſome ſpecial priviledges, the root, the Parent being holy, and in the Covenant, his Child hath the advantage of it; not meritoriouſly from the Parents faith, but virtually through Gods gracious promiſe to the believer and his ſeed. But,

3. This is not by natural generation, for then it ſhould be to all Children; but by grace and proportion; its Gods good pleaſure thus to derive the priviledge, and out of ſpecial reſpect to the Parents & to encourage them in their own faith, & ſtrengthen them in their hopes concerning their ſeed: thus did God chooſe out *Abraham* and his family from all the world, and bleſſed him: yet it was not from nature his ſeed were more bleſſed than all the world beſides. But as Dr. *Willet* ſaith well on this place, *The branches are holy, becauſe of this holy root; not by an actual and inherent holineſſe, but by a prerogative*

rogative of grace grounded on the promiſe of God made to believing Fathers and their ſeed; which is the ſame in the New Teſtament as in the Old; and in this ſenſe the argument is ſtrong, and enforcing the ſcope of the Apoſtle. So that though the generation be natural, the derivation of a Title to Church-priviledges, and the characteriſtical note of holineſſe is given them by grace in the Covenant, which takes in the branches with the root. In no ſenſe beſides can this argument be true, without you make the root Chriſt: which you ſee cannot be meant in this place without great abſurdities.

The third and ſpecial term to be opened, is, what this ingraffing is of the Gentiles into the root, and how they are ingraffed? v.17,19.

For the underſtanding of this, Mr. *Marſhall* hath laid down a ſure poſition, which neither Mr. *Tombs, who is the moſt learned Adverſary of this Truth*, nor any other hath or can ſhake; and that is, *That the ingraffing in of the gentiles muſt be ſutable to the breaking off the Jews; as they were broken off, ſo are we ingraffed*: This the Apoſtle clearly proves in every verſe. in v.17. *Thou being a wilde Olive*, ſpeaking of the Gentiles collectively conſidered, wert ingraffed, ἐν αὐτοῖς, *in, amongſt them*; ſo *Grotius* tranſlateth it, *Poſitus es inter ramos illius arboris*, Thou art ſet among the branches of that tree; and ſo referring to the firſt words of the verſe, which is implyed, that ſome remained ſtill; for but ſome of the branches were broken off, and the Gentile believers

Elevers were inoculated among them, and by a ſpecial adoption were partakers of the ſame priviledges; according to that of the Poet *Ovid:*

Venerit inſitio: fac ramum, ramus adoptet.

But the beſt reference is to the former part of the verſe, as it ſpeaks of theſe branches which were broken off; the believing Gentiles were ingraffed, (ἐν αὐτοῖς) that is, as *Beza* and the *Syriack* tranſlates it, *pro ipſis*, for them, that is, *in ramorum defractorum locum*, in the room or ſtead of the branches which were broken off; they were taken away, we ingraffed: Others tranſlate it, *cum illis*, with them, which remained when we were inſerted: but either interpretation will become the ſenſe of the place.

Now the reaſons which flow from this Text concerning the ſubject which we have in hand, may be eaſier ſlighted than anſwered: This poſition being laid down, *We believing Gentiles are ingraffed into* Abrahams *Covenant, in the room of the natural branches which were broken off*: Now,

1. The Jews and their children were broken off from the Church, their children being members as well as themſelves; therefore believing Gentiles and their children are engraffed in, the ingraffing in is ſutable to the breaking off: they have nibbled about this reaſon; but the beſt of theſe adverſaries have never ſaid any thing yet, as to ſatisfie a rational Saint.

2. Some branches were not broken off; for so it's implyed, in that he saith, *If some were broken off*; and if they were not broken off, then not their children; for it was not only a breaking off personally, but of succession, and of their posterity with themselves: Now if we be ingraffed among these, or with these that are not broken off, we and our Children must likewise be ingraffed in; else there will be a schism between Jew and Gentile, in enjoying the priviledges naturally flowing from the same root: No man will be so bold as to say, that the believing Jews were broken off; and if not they, then not their Children which were then Infants, and had not acted unbelief: for either they must be broken off for their own sins, or their Fathers; not for their Fathers, for some of the n were believers, and not broken off; not for themselves, for some of them were Infants; therefore some Infants were not broken off; for their Fathers continued in the faith and we believing Gentiles are ingraff d in among them; therefore our Children also.

3. In the latter end, when the Jews shall be ingraffed in again to their own Olive, which is promised in this Chapter, they and their Children shall be taken in, v. 26. *And so all* Israel *shall be saved*; and our ingraffing in is still suitable to theirs.

4. The Gentiles are said to partake of the root, and the fatnesse of the Olive tree, in the same verse this (Συγκοινωνὸς τ῀ ῥίζης) signifies the full participation and fellowship in all the priviledges & advantages

tages of the root, as the Jews had. Now their priviledge was not perſonal to themſelves, but to their poſterity; and therein lay the fatneſſe of that Olive, in the fulneſſe and large extent of its priviledge and ſeminal vertue, that it comprehended Parent and Child. So that as the Jews caſting off was not only perſonal, but Politique, that is, of them and theirs: ſo our ingraffing in their room is; and as they had the fatneſſe of the root and Olive once, ſo have we. Now we could not be ſaid to be, (Συγκοινωνὸς τ῀ ῥίζης κ᾽ τ῀ πιότητ῀ τ῀ ἐλαίας) *To have a mutual fellowſhip with the Jews in the root and fatneſſe of it*, if we be only perſonally ingraffed, and they and theirs broken off œconomically; if there be a fellowſhip, it muſt be at leaſt in ſubſtantials: And this was the moſt eminent and ſubſtantial priviledge of the Jews, that they and their poſterity were taken into the ſame Covenant: The Apoſtle opens this further in *Eph* 3.6.

And eſpecially, if we remember, that their breaking off, and our ingraffing, is into the viſible Church as is formerly proved, and muſt needs be granted; for all that were broken off, were not broken off from election, and the inviſible Church; neither are all the Gentiles which are ingraffed in, elected, and really of the inviſible Church. So that the reſult is this.

1. That there is a real ingraffing of the believing Gentiles into the ſame root from which the unbelieving Jews were broken off.

2. This breaking off was from the viſible Church, and its priviledges, not from the inviſible; ſo is the

ingraffing of us into the visible Church.

3. As their casting out was of them and their posterity, so is our graffing in of us and our Children; These conclusions flow naturally from the Text; and all other deductions will be but as dregs after the spirits are extracted.

4. And to add to the rest this consideration, That if the posterity of the Gentiles be not taken in as the Jews were, there will be the greatest inequality of the communication of the fatness of the root that can be imagined; and the Jews may rather boast against the believing Gentiles, than they against them; seeing the root conveyed priviledges to them and their posterity, but onely personal priviledges to the believing Gentile; to the one a double mercy, to the other only a single.

Ob. But this great Objection may be made; No believer is now a root as *Abraham*, he is but only a branch; and therefore its not to be conceived how it can be argued from this to every believer, *If the root be holy, so are the branches*, as it may be to *Abraham*.

Sol. It's granted, every believer, nor any, cannot properly be called the root, as *Abraham* was, and in a strict sense: Yet,

1. They are ingraffed into the same root, and convey the same priviledges to their branches, as *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and the *twelve Tribes* did to their posterities, who were not properly nor absolutely the root, but branches of it; and we all know, that

a

a Slip well inoculated or ingraffed, becomes afterwards a natural branch; and receives as much from the root, as theſe which grew naturally on it: So that its as ſtrong to argue on the Gentiles ſide after ingraffing; *If the root be holy, ſo are the branches*; as from *Abraham* to the Jews, who were natural branches; As an adopted ſon, him and his have as full a title to the inheritance as a natural ſon.

There is onely this difference between the conveyance of priviledges of the Jews as natural branches, and the ingraffed Gentiles; That the whole body of the Jews, good and bad, were called branches; now only *Believers of the Gentiles*, who are called by the Goſpel, with their children, are ingraffed into that root.

2. Though every Believer is not the proper root, but onely a branch of the root; yet for being ingraffed, he is naturalized as the Jewiſh branch, and ſo muſt have the ſame priviledge.

3. There are branches of branches; and the pooreſt branch hath ſome twigs, and ſpreading ſprigs growing from them which are of the ſame conſideration, and do receive of the fatneſs of the root as well as the main branches; and in this ſenſe every branch may be ſaid to be the immediate root of the leſſer twigs: Thus believers ingraffed into the root are holy, and their infants that are branches of the branches immediatly ſprouting forth from them, are holy alſo, & under the ſame conſideration; & the argument holds ſtill for the ingraffed branches, as

for the natural.

And as Mr. *Blake* ſaith well, *The branches of Anceſtors are roots of poſterity; being made a holy branch, in reference to their iſſue, they become a holy root.* This might be much more enlarged, but that I would not be voluminous; its enough that believers are ingraffed with their Children into the ſame root, as is formerly proved.

And then the argument holds firme, That theſe that are in the root, muſt partake of the fatneſſe of it; and they which are in the Covenant, cannot be denied the priviledges of it.

CHAP. IX.

Wherein Mr. Tombes *his eight Arguments in his* Apology *againſt Mr.* Marſhal, *for the ingraffing in, mentioned* v. 17. *to be of the Gentiles into the inviſible Church by election and ſaving faith, are examined and anſwered.*

THe great endeavor of theſe who are of the contrary opinion in opening this Chapter, is, To prove that the ingraffing of the Gentiles into the root is by election and ſaving faith, and ſo into the inviſible Church; for they ſee their caſe is in hazard if it ſhould be meant of the viſible Church: And therefore, though enough be ſpoken before to prove what we affirm, yet becauſe Mr. *Tombes* hath laid

laid down eight Arguments with ſo much confidence on the other ſide as unanſwerable; I think it not amiſs to beſtow one Chapter in the diſcovery of the unſoundneſs of his reaſons, that the truth may have a fairer paſſage into your underſtanding without clouds or demurs.

His firſt reaſon is, *Apologie p. 71. That ingraffing which is by Gods ſole power, it is into the inviſible Church: but ſo is the ingraffing of the Iews,* v. 3. Ergo. *For God is able to graff them.*

Sol. 1. As to argue from Gods power to his will, is alwayes unſound in Divinity and in Reaſon; God is able, therefore he will: So,

2. To argue from power to election, is of the ſame nature; for election is ſeldome or never attributed to Gods power, but to his will or good pleaſure.

3. To argue from Gods power in general, to the putting of it forth abſolutely in ſuch a determinate act, is as ſtrange; God is able to graffe them in, *Ergo* it muſt be into the inviſible Church; as if God ſhewed nothing of his power, but in the workings of ſaving grace; eſpecially if we conſider what a power it is, and onely from God: But to take the very prejudice the Jews have even from the letter of the Goſpel to bring them but to confeſſe Chriſt, after ſo long a darkneſſe, as it was in the beginning of the Goſpel, but to make the Gentiles but outwardly own and profeſs the Goſpel, and yet not members of the inviſible Church; to take away the very groſsneſſe

groſneſs of naturall darkneſſe and ignorance, is a work of mighty power; And to an outward converſion, where perſons have been long under the power of darkneſſe, there needs the ſole power of God.

4. The Apoſtle may well put in rather Gods power than his will, when he ſpeaks of the ingraffing in of the Jews; for it will require an act of power to gather them but viſibly once again, and bring them into one entire body to make a viſible Church, when they are ſo ſcattered up & down all Nations, and at ſuch a diſtance one from another, that it is as the gathering of the bones of dead men; and ſo its likened to the reſurrection from the dead, v. 15. So that we need go no further to enquire why their ingraffing ſhould be attributed to Gods power, ſeeing there is need enough of a Divine power but to gather them together from the four winds, to make a collective body, and ſo to be a viſible Church.

Beſides, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of power in working of ſaving faith, he doth put other Epithites to ſet it forth: & not only barely ſpeaks of power which God puts forth in all acts, but exceeding greatneſſe of power, *Eph.* 1.21,22.

Arg. 2. His ſecond Argument is, *That ingraffing which is called reconciliation, oppoſite to caſting away, that is by election and giving faith: but ſo is the ingraffing called*, v. 15.

Sol. If he means reconciliation in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, as it denotes pardon of ſins, and being made friends

friends with God by Christs attonement and mediatorship, which must be his sense, if he speak like himselfe: Then many absurdities may follow.

1. That the Jews and their rejection was the ground of the Gentiles reconciliation unto God.

2. That no reconciliation was obtained for the Gentiles before the Jews were broken off.

3. That those which are reconciled, and their sins pardoned, may be cast off, for so were the Jews; and the Gentiles threatned with the same misery on the same ground, v. 20.

4. As there is external and eternal salvation spoken of, 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. so there may be an outward and inward reconciliation; the Gentiles were cast out from the visible Church for so many hundreds of years, without any hope or promise, *And strangers to the Commonwealth of Israel*, Ephes. 2. 11, 12. and so visibly cast off; and it was a great reconciliation but to break down the middle wall of partition between Jew & Gentile, as to visible priviledges and Ordinances: And so by the reconciling the world may be more properly meant the bringing them in under the means of the Gospel, and the outward dispensations of the Church; which is Gods common way and method of salvation; and which to some is real and effectual unto inward grace, unto others only to outward priviledges

And the very phrase, *the reconciliation of the world*, to Orthodox ears, deafens and distheth the other interpretation; for the body of the Gentile-world

(which

(which he means) are not ſo reconciled as by election and ſaving grace, though the ſound of the Goſpel hath gone through all the world.

Ob. 3. *Thirdly*, ſaith he, *the ingraffing muſt be meant of that act whereby the branch ſtands in the tree as a branch: but that is by giving of Faith. The minor is proved alſo*, v. 20. *they were broken off by unbelief, and we ſtand by faith, &c.*

Sol. Its true, the ingraffing is by faith, as their breaking off was by unbelief: but as their unbelief was ſhewn in a publique rejection of the Goſpel, and by it they and their Children were broken off: ſo the Gentiles are ingraffed in by publique profeſſion of faith, and acceptation of the Goſpel for themſelves and their Children; and this muſt needs be the Apoſtles meaning: For,

1. Ver. 18. He bids the Gentiles not to boaſt againſt the branches that were broken off. Now how could they boaſt againſt them but for viſible priviledges? inviſible, are out of cognizance to others: Do Saints boaſt againſt one another for election and reprobation? theſe ſecrets of the Almighty: This Argument Mr. *Baxter* urgeth with much advantage, in his Book.

2. In *v.* 19 he explains further what the nature of their boaſting might be; thou wilt ſay The branches were broken off, that I might be ingraffed: now can any man conceive they ſhould boaſt becauſe the branches, the Jews were broken from election and true faith, that they might be graffed in by a new act of

Gods

Gods election, and by true and ſaving faith? So in ver 20,21,22,23. he exhorts the Gentiles *to look to their ſtanding, and to take heed leaſt they be broken off alſo; For if God ſpared not the naturall branches, &c. much leſſe will he ſpare thee:* What are they exhorted to look to, leaſt they be cut off from Gods election, *&c.* Will Mr. *Tombes* turn a down-right *Arminian* that he may have any plea againſt the baptizing of poor Infants?

There is a twofold way of ingraffing, either by ſpiritual implantation into Chriſt, or by viſible profeſſion of faith; and both theſe ſhould meet in one perſon, though they may alſo be ſeparated; a viſible Profeſſor may not have ſaving faith within, *yet may have:* So here, the ingraffing in is into the viſible Church by viſible profeſſion; among which ſome are, ſome are not inviſible members: but the very *terminus* of ingraffing is not into the inviſible, but the viſible Church; for neither the Apoſtle, nor an Angel could tell who were ingraffed into the inviſible Church, nor who broken off, but only from the viſible Church, firſt as the proper term, and then by conſequence from the inviſible; for from this Church none were abſolutely broken off that ever were in, and into it few ingraffed.

So that if the ingraffing be viſible, the term muſt be viſible alſo: but the ingraffing is viſible, *Ergo* the term is ſo: This is according to Mr. *Tombes* his own form of argumentation, from the term to the ingraffing; the major is proved before.

Ob.

Ob. *Fourthly, That ingraffing is meant,* v. 17. *whereby the wild Olive is co partaker of the root and fatneſs of the Olive; but ſuch is only election and ſaving faith*; he proves the *minor* by diſtinguiſhing who the root is, which he well affirms to be *Abraham.*

Sol. To which there needs no other anſwer than what Mr *Blake* hath given him; *If the root be* Abraham, *and the ingraffing in be only by election, and derivation of ſaving graces* (which he means by *the fatneſs of the Olive*) *then it muſt be that we are all elect in* Abraham *as a common root*; Abraham *may ſay, Without me you can do nothing.*

To which Mr. *Tombes* only anſwers by confeſſion, *That it would follow if he made* Abraham *a root as Chriſt communicating ſaving faith: but I make* Abraham *a root as the Father of Believers, not by begetting faith, but as an exemplary cauſe.* How poor an evaſion is this of ſo confident a man in his opinion, I ſubmit to judgement.

Let him mind his Argument, and the force of it; *That ingraffing is meant whereby the wild Olive is partaker of the fatneſs of the root: but that is only election and ſaving grace, &c.*

1. Were not the natural branches which were broken off partakers of the fatneſſe of the root? and were they all elected and partakers of ſaving graces or outward priviledges only? and why then ſhould it be thought abſurd for the Gentiles by ingraffing to partake of the fatneſs of the root only in outward priviledges, ſeeing it was ſo with the natural bran-

branches, and they all grow on the same root?

2. The old absurdity will arise still from this, *That Saints may fall away from election and saving grace.*

3. How can he imagine *Abraham* to be the root, and the fatness of the root to be election and saving graces, and that engrafting the way of being co-partakers with the root, and yet deny Mr. *Blakes* Argument, *That we are elected in* Abraham?

1. It is improper to call a root an exemplary cause, there is no harmonie betweene them; an example conveyes nothing; here is a conveyance of fatness.

2. How unsutable to good language is it to say, That such are partakers of the fatness or fulness of an example? can we think the Apostle would so far over-reach?

3. Were the Jews partakers of the fatness of *Abraham* in the Covenant, meerly as from an exemplary cause? had not they it from him as a naturall Father, God making the Covenant with him and his seed? and do not ingraffed branches afterwards become as natural?

He only adds, p. 73. *That if it were meant of outward priviledges, it were false; for the Gentiles were not partakers of the outward priviledges of* Abraham.

Sol. Abraham is a root in the New Testament as well as in the Old, and still stands by virtue of the Covenant to Believers and their Children: And though Old Testament Ordinances were taken away with the Jews, and that Church-state, yet the root is not taken away; but the New Testament-priviledges

grow

grow on the ſame root; & our ingraffing in gives us to be partakers of the fatneſs of them, as well as it gave to the Jews the participation of former priviledges until they were broken off.

All the reſt of his arguments are much of the ſame nature; only a touch further of each of them.

Ob. 5 From v. 25. *If the breaking off the Jews be by blinding, then the ingraffing is by giving faith; but the former is true, ſo the latter.*

Sol. This is the ſame in effect with the third Argument: Yet,

1. There is not the ſame reaſon, ſeeing he takes it of giving ſaving faith; their blinding was judicial, a puniſhment for their unbelieving, rejecting of the Goſpel; though they had not ſaving faith to embrace the Goſpel; the giving of ſaving faith is not on ſuch terms; neither is ſaving faith ſo abſolutely antecedent to make a man a member of the viſible Church, as blinding is to Gods final rejection.

2. Blindneſs came but in part on *Iſrael*; it fell only on the meer viſible members, not the inviſible and elect: therefore the ingraffing muſt be onely of viſible members into the viſible Church, v. 7. The election hath obtained it, but the reſt were blinded.

Arg. 6. *If re-ingraffing of the Jews produceth ſalvation, is by turning them from their iniquity, &c. then it is to the inviſible Church: but ſo it is,* v, 26, 27 Ergo.

Sol. To which I give this faire Anſwer, That doubtleſs

doubtleſs according to thoſe promiſes, when the Jews ſhall be called in to be a viſible Church again, there ſhall be abundance of more glory be brought in with them, than ever yet the world ſaw; and the new Heavens and the new Earth, the coming down of the new *Jeruſalem*, and all thoſe glorious things are fitted to fall in with that time. And from theſe conſiderations many do interpret v. 26 literally, *And ſo ſhall all* Iſrael *be ſaved.* But yet,

1. They ſhall be ingraffed in as a viſible Church, elſe *Abraham* and the Fathers would never be mentioned as roots.

2. They ſhall be ingraffed in as they were broken off: now they were brok n off as a viſible Church;

3. All that can be gathered is this, That the fulneſs of ſalvation, and the virtues of the promiſes, ſhall more fully and univerſally take effect on the Jews, even to the ſalvation of all of them; and ſo the inviſible and viſible Church be more pure; *and as one in the earth*: but this fulneſs ſhall be to them as a viſible Church, and on the earth.

Arg. 7. *If the re-ingraffing be by vertue of Gods election and love, then it is to the inviſible Church: but the former is true,* v. 28. Ergo.

Sol. 1. It's ſaid, That as touching election, the Jews are beloved for their Fathers ſake; hence it follows, God hath a love of election to Believers, and their natural ſeed; for ſo the Jews were the naturall ſeed of *Abraham:* But,

2. It's

2. It's granted that the calling fo the Jews ſhall be according to Gods election and firſt love; and that Gods election ſhall more fully take hold of the Jews at their re calling, than of any Nation: but yet ſtill the Argument is of no force to prove that their re-ingraffing, and ſo ours, is only or firſtly into the inviſible Church; for they are elected as well to be a viſible Church, as to be partakers of inward graces; and their re-ingraffing muſt be ſpecially and firſtly into the viſible Church from which they were broken off, or elſe there will be no correſpondence between their rejection and re-ingraffing.

The laſt and weakeſt Argument is this; *If the ingraffing of Jews and Gentiles be the fruit of Gods mercy, the breaking off by ſhutting up in unbelief; then it is into the inviſible Church, by election, &c. but ſo it is*; Ergo.

Sol. You ſee he hath ſpent his ſtock and ſtrength to be ſo low at laſt: This argument needs no Anſwer, but by ſhewing you the unſoundneſſe of this univerſal propoſition on which the Argument is built. *Whatever is a fruit of Gods mercy, is from election and ingraffing into the inviſible Church*: Which propoſition is moſt falſe, univerſally conſidered: Are not health, meat and drink, preſervation, all outward priviledges, fruits of Gods mercy? Is not long-ſuffering to theſe that periſh, and the affording the means of grace and ſalvation, the inſtitution of Ordinances, fruits of Gods mercy? and yet muſt they be given onely to elect ones? and do they ingraff to the Inviſible Church? but *ſatineſt repetere?* you have

ſeen

ſeen the utmoſt ſtrength of the greateſt Antagoniſt to the Truth we hold out.

CHAP. X.

The Harmonie of Mat. 19.13, 14. *with* Mar. 10. 13. *and* Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17. *concerning the bringing of Infants to Chriſt, his acts to them, how far it contributes to prove Infant-baptiſm.*

YOu have ſeen how the Scriptures agree in holding out ſome ſpecial priviledges in the New Teſtament, as in the Old, to Believers and their ſeed: Let us now come to view Chriſts own carriage and actions to Infants; which ſhews both the ſpecial reſpect he had to them, and would have his Miniſters and Churches to have likewiſe. For this, compare Mat. 19. 13, 14. Mar. 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. with Luke 18. 15, 16, 17. *Where when little Children were brought to Chriſt, and his Diſciples did forbid them, Chriſt was angry, and charged them not to hinder them, for theirs was the Kingdom of Heaven; and he took them up in his arms, laid his hands upon them, and bleſſed them.* For the opening this place more clearely, conſider,

1. Who they were which were brought to Chriſt.
2. Who brought them.

3. VVhy

3. Why the Diſciples did forbid them to be brought.

4. Chriſts reaſon why he would have them not hindred.

5. Chriſts actions to and on them, what they amount unto.

For the firſt, who they were which were brought to Chriſt; in *Mark* they are called παιδία, and well tranſlated *little Children*, or Infants; the word is a diminutive word, and is ſpecially to be applied to Infants, *Luke* 1.76. *Zacharias* uſeth the ſame word of *John*, when he was newly born; *And thou Child*, (παιδίον) *ſhalt be called the prophet of the Higheſt*, &c. *Videtur eſſe aliqua emphaſis diminutivi, hoc ſaltem loco minime negligenda*, ſaith *Beza*. The ſame word is given to Chriſt when he was in the Manger, *Mat.* 2. 11. *The wiſe men found* παιδίον, *the young Child*, or Infant, *with* Mary. &c. *Heb.* 11. 23. *Moſes* is called παιδίον, when he was hid among the Flags. This word, ſaith *Hippocrates*, is given to theſe which are under the age of ſeven years; and it's moſtly uſed among the Evangeliſts for to expreſs the tendereſt age of man, which is Infancy: *So Spanhem. dub. Evang.*

Παιδίον, teſte Hippocrate, *de primo vitæ ſeptennio dicitur*; παῖς *autem de ſecundo*. Gurti.

But in *Luke* the holy Ghoſt uſeth another word of full ſignification for Infants (τὰ βρέφη) which word is uſed for a Babe in the womb, an Embryo, *Luk.* 1, 41. *When* Elizabeth *heard the ſalutation of* Mary, *the Babe leaped in her womb*; ἐσκίρτησε τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ

κοιλία μητρὸς; it's the ſame word: but more properly it is uſed for a Child newly born, a ſucking babe that we carry in our armes: Thus 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. *Timothy* is ſaid *to know the Scriptures from a Child*, ἀπὸ βρέφους, *from his Infancy*; not when he was an Infant, but from his Infancy; that is, as ſoon as ever he was paſt a Babe, & came to underſtand any thing, he was learnt the Scriptures. The ſame word βρέφος is given alſo to Chriſt, when the Wiſe men found him in ſwadling clouts, *Luk.* 2. 12. So that this is moſt clear, that they were Infants, tender young ones, Babes which were brought to Chriſt; And if the two words did not properly ſignifie Infants, yet in that it's ſaid they were brought to Chriſt, would prove it; for the word προσφέρειν properly ſignifies *to carry*, as it's uſed moſtly in ſcripture for. But,

2. Who thoſe were that brought them, it's moſt probable that their Parents brought them; and theſe had believed themſelves, or made ſome profeſſion of faith; for they bring them to Chriſt to be under his bleſſing, for ſome ſpecial favour to be ſhewn by Chriſt to them; it was for a ſpiritual end they brought them, to be touched by Chriſt &c. to have ſome virtue from him; & who could have ſuch bowels to bring Infants to Chriſt, but their own Parents? and to abide the frowns of the Diſciples, and their checks, but Parents, who love their Children next themſelves, and would have them bleſſed together with them? ſo that it's more probable it was their Parents which brought them than any others; and

that they were Believers, who had such a sense of their Infants conditions, and of Christs respects.

And besides, they were then in the Coasts of *Judea*, where many had profest their faith, and were baptized by *Iohn*, and longed to have their Infants confirmed by Jesus Christ; especially when we look on Mat. 19. 13. *They brought them to Christ to lay his hands on them, and pray over them.*

3. If we consider why the Disciples should forbid them, and rebuked those that brought them, surely it could not be out of any cruelty to Infants, or that the Disciples had no bowels to Infants, or desire they might not be happy with their Parents; their affections could not be so straightned and bound up in unnaturalnesse: but it must be from some such principle which these of the contrary judgment take up, That they were not capable, and were first to be taught; That onely grown men, and Professors of faith, were fit for Ordinances; and therefore they rebuked or chid them, and forbad them to do so any more: As if they had said, What have we to do with Children, as to outward Ordinances? they are not capable, they cannot professe their faith; and we must have persons able to hold forth the Gospel, which must be visible subjects of Christs Kingdome: Doubtless some such grounds they must needs go on, or else they must shew a strange kinde of passion against Children, most unbecoming these which had but the rags of natural affection left in them.

4. See

4. See Christs affections to them, and the reason of it; *When Christ saw it* (ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸ) *he was much displeased*: It's a word that is used to expresse such a kinde of sorrow as breaks the heart; also to stomack any thing, and to have the spirit raised in contempt of an unworthy action or person: Thus Christ was grieved at them, and he looked with contempt on his Disciples, as dealing most unworthily with poor Infants, in forbidding them to be brought to Christ; and therefore he commands them to suffer them to bring Infants to him, & not to forbid them. These two words shews how vehement Christ was & how much his heart was set towards Infants. You finde sometimes that Christ gave some sharpe words to his Disciples, and to *Peter* especially; but never to have his spirit to rise in indignation against them, as when they would forbid Infants to be brought to him; & that which makes Christ so earnest, must needs be of great weight; he was never so moved when they all forsook him, and *Peter* did forswear him, as when they denyed Infants to come to him.

I could wish that these, which with so much contemps and scurrillous language forbid Infants to be baptized, might read this place with observant spirits, and at least grow more sober and less violent in their expressions concerning poor Infants; doubtless it's a warning to all Christs Disciples.

Now the reason which Jesus Christ gives, is, *Of such is the Kingdom of God:* The reason shews what the priviledge was, they would exclude Infants

from, *viz.* being visibly judged to belong to the Kingdom of God; and Christ saith, *Of such is the Kingdom of God.* Now take the Kingdom of God either for Heaven and Glory; or secondly by way of allusion, for the Church, and the state of the Gospel, it will serve as a full reason: Of such, that is, of Infants, is Gods Kingdom made up, as well as of grown men, and they are as fit subjects as you are: But doubtlesse he especially meanes by *the Kingdom of God,* as well the Kingdom of Grace in a visible Church, as the Kingdom of Glory; because else this could be no reason to convince the Disciples of their errour, for they were against the visible bringing Infants to Christ for to get some outward sign of favour to them; and Christ tels them, they may be as well brought to Christ, and receive a visible sign, as grown persons; for the Kingdom of God is made of such, as of others.

1. Christ shews their intereſt in one of the highest priviledges, *The Kingdom of God,* and that visibly.

2. He speaks it *de præsenti*; not onely respecting their future estate, what they may be; but that even now the Kingdom of God is of such.

3. He useth this as a common instructive principle for the future, never to forbid, not only these, but such like Infants to be brought to him: For τοιούτων *Of such is the Kingdom of God:* Christ would have them take it as a constant principle, That wherever they found such like Infants, they should not reject them,

them, but look on them with Goſpel-reſpect.

Obj. Theſe that differ have nothing to ſay to this, but, That Chriſt means it of ſuch, as children for humility, and meekneſſe, and lowlineſſe; and therefore in the following verſe he ſaith, *He that ſhall not receive the Kingdom of God as a little Child; ſhall not enter therein.*

Sol. It's true Chriſt takes an occaſion to exhort them to humility and meekneſſe, from the pattern of theſe little ones. But,

1. Chriſt ſhewes Infants right to the Kingdom of God, as well as the diſciples, and grown perſons, who can profeſſe their own faith.

2. If Chriſt had meant only to make an example and reſemblance, he might have taken Sheep, and Doves more properly; for they are more meek and gentle than Children, who are commonly froward and peeviſh.

3. This croſſeth the end of Chriſts reaſon, which was that Infants ſhould not be hindred from being brought to Chriſt, For *of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* Now if he had meant of ſuch as were onely like them in ſome qualities, not of themſelves, there was nothing at all in Chriſts reaſon: And thus muſt the words be rendred on that account; *Suffer infants to come to me, and do not forbid them; for not of them, but of humble perſons that reſemble them, is the Kingdom of of God.* Men will rather make Chriſt ſpeak non-ſenſe, than looſe their opinions.

4. Can we think Chriſt could be ſo diſpleaſed with his

his Disciples for hindring little ones to be brought to him, meerly to shew them as resemblances and patterns to grown men; and add this reason, *For of such is the Kingdom of God*, when he had examples more fit to that purpose, even among the meere sensible Creatures? No, Christ shews the priviledge of such Infants; and checks his Disciples pride, who would have none but themselves and grown persons to be esteemed, as having any visible interest in the Kingdom of God.

Lastly, Let us view Christs carriage and actions to these infants; he did not onely shew them as examples, but *took them up in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them*: all expressions of the most signal love, and favour, and of great import, if duly considered.

1. He took them up in his arms, ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ; the word signifies to embrace with special affections, so the French Translation *Embrasser*, *Piscator embrachiare*, *amplexabundè gesto*, Bud. Christ took them up in his arms, and held them forth as Monuments of his love; and doubtlesse to shew his Disciples, that he would have some outward sign and character of peculiar respect set on them by his Church and Saints: Such a carriage was not out of a natural affection only to these that could not pity themselves, but from a heavenly strain of love which he bore to these little ones, as to the highest professing Disciple; and must needs be symbolical to his Churches, to take heed how they reject them wholly

wholly from any visible right to the Kingdom of God: Christ was to leave the world shortly, but he leaves it as a rule to his Disciples.

2. Christ layes his hands on them, which was used among the Jews as a form of special blessing, and in the N. T. for eminent ends.

1. For to cure all sorts of diseases by a miraculous power, *Luk.* 4.40.

2. For consecration of any to a Divine work and service; thus Church-Officers were solemnly separated to Christs work, as peculiarly fit for it, *Acts* 6.6 *Acts* 13.3. 1 *Tim.* 4.15. and 5.22. 2 *Tim.* 1.6.

3. It was used for confirmation after Baptism, and as an outward way whereby the holy Ghost was conveyed; and this is the most common use of it in the Acts of the Apostles, *Acts* 8. 17,18,19. and 19.6 where those that were baptized had the Apostles hands laid on them, and they received the holy Ghost: and to this purpose may we apply Christs act to these Infants, to confirme the promise solemnly after Baptism. For,

1. It was ever used (except to sick persons) after Baptism.

2. As it presupposeth Baptism to precede, so it's an outward sign of a special significancy, and holds forth as much as if Christ had baptized them: for in that outward rite the holy Ghost was conveyed, & by laying on of hands others received the holy Ghost, as the former Scriptures expres; and why not in this act of Christ on them? Take all the circumstances

cumſtances together, and you cannot imagine it to be a complemental act, And if this were as an outward ſign of their receiving the holy Ghoſt, *What ſhould hinder water that infants ſhould not be baptized, ſeeing they have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* Acts 10.47. Chriſt laid his hands on them, *Benedictas ſcilicet manus in quas à Patre ſuo acceperat omnia bona Cœli & Terræ*, ſaith a learned Divine on this place; *He laid thoſe bleſſed hands on them, in which he had received from the Father all good things in Heaven and Earth.* This act ſhews,

1. That Chriſt would have ſome outward viſible ſign of favour ſet on ſuch Infants by Churches: and Impoſition of Hands being one of the choyceſt, Chriſt uſeth that as moſt proper to ſhew his Authority.

2. That holds forth, That if they be capable of impoſition of hands, they are of an Ordinance of like nature, which eſpecially looks at a ſubject purely paſſive.

Obj. If it be Objected, Why did not Chriſt baptize them as well as lay his hands on them, if he meant to hint out their right to Baptiſm.

Sol. It's eaſily anſwered, That Chriſt baptized none at all; but he did that which was an Ordinance uſually in thoſe Primitive times adminiſtred after Baptiſm, and equal to it, as to its dignity; and ſo far above Baptiſm, as it was more extraordinary in its practice: And ſo we may argue from this to Baptiſm, either incluſively, or *a majori*, from the greater; and

I

I have more from this place to confirm me, that if Christ baptized any, he would these Infants; seeing he shews so much respect to them, more than to any grown person; and did to them those acts which were equivalent, if not supereminent to them, than any can have against it. Let any that differ from us shew any where in the Gospel where Christ laid his hands on any but desperate diseased persons to shew his power, or on Infants to shew his love, and confirm their antient priviledges, or upon any person in this latter sense unbaptized.

Obj. 2. If it be said, This was an extraordinary act of Christ, and no ordinary pattern may be drawn from it.

Sol. I answer; Grant it to be extraordinary, yet it argues more strongly, if Christ used an extraordinary act to shew his affection and love to Infants, much more may the Church shew ordinary acts to them.

2. Christ shewed this extraordinary carriage, the more to check and convince his Disciples for their extraordinary contempt of poor Infants, who would not allow them an ordinary interest in visible priviledges. And it's considerable, that Imposition of Hands was not an usual Ordinance, or administred by any but Christ before the ascension of Christ, and the sending of the holy Ghost.

3. Though Christs act should be extraordinary, in regard of the imitation of that act by us; yet he grounds it on an ordinary rule and principle; *For of such*

such is the Kingdome of God; which he lales down as a fundamental rule. And this is the least that can be gathered from it; That if Christ on this ground set an extraordinary sign on Infants, because the Kingdome of God did visibly belong to them; we may on the same principle set an ordinary, initiating sign on them, as visible members of that glorious state, as well as on grown visible Professors, who are but probable members, according to the most judicious charity; especially if we will think Christs judgement in such cases equal with our own.

But lest all this should be thought but a meer outward act of Christs, that carried nothing of any inward design of grace, he blessed them after all, as the fullest expression of his heart; and to demonstrate, that whatever grace he had should be theirs as others: for so the word, ἐυλόγει αὐτὰ, signifies, either to speak well of, or to any concerning persons or things; and thus Christ may be thought to speak much of the state and priviledges of these Infants; or else to bless them, by desiring for them, or communicating to them all sorts of mercies, as blessings; according to that *Eph.* 1.3. And what can be more than for Christ to take up Infants in his arms, lay his hands on them, as an outward sign, to consecrate them to himself, and to shew their capacity of receiving the holy Ghost, and then to bless them; which comprehends the communication of all graces, and all good things? And yet we must with scorn (poor probable Disciples our selves) deny them a little

little water; and think it too much to have them named among the loweſt ſort of viſible Saints, when Chriſt owns them publickly, and ſaith, that *of ſuch as theſe is the Kingdome of God*; and they may have more intereſt in that Kingdome, than theſe that exclude them: but I ſhall rather believe Chriſts teſtimony, than any mans froward opinion: Its only a wonder how Saints, that have felt Chriſts bowels themſelves, and read this Text, can be ſo rigid to Infants of Believers, to whom Chriſt hath been ſo kinde, and exemplary in his carriages; and ſtampt ſuch viſible characters of his love on, even in adminiſtration of outward ſigns. To what end ſhould Chriſt do all this in ſuch a high and peremptory ſtrain of affection, if it were not to teach us charity and reſpect to Infants, in theſe ordinary adminiſtrations they are capable of; and to confirm their old ſtate in the Church, by ſuch a new and unwonted carriage; Chriſt abounding to them who were moſt undervalued, and could ſay nothing for themſelves? And how harſh is it to conceive, that Chriſts intent was hereafter to caſt them out of the viſible Church & from the participation of all outward ſigns of ſalvation, when his carriage was thus tranſcendently loving to them; and ſo only to give them a lightning before death? Let mens conſciences, not gulph'd in prejudice, judge: This Text, if there were no more, will fly in the Conſciences one day of the moſt confident Contemners of Infants, and their Baptiſm.

I ſhall onely add; to ſatisfie the learned, the conſent of godly and eminent Authors on this Scripture.

Non eſt ulla hiſtoria in toto codice Evangelico, quæ frequentius in Templo legatur, quam hæc ipſa. Quoties enim Infans ad ſacrum baptiſmatis fontem affertur, toties etiam ex agendis Eccleſiaſticis *hæc hiſtoria recitatur; ſed admodum raro eadem in* Eccleſia *recitatur.* Chemnitius & Polycarpus, Lyſerus in Harm. Evang.

And doubtleſſe it's no ordinary note, that three of the Evangeliſts ſhould ſo punctually relate this ſtory without any conſiderable change of words or ſenſe. All the Objection is, becauſe the word *Baptiſm* is not inſerted, when as much as that comes to is; and that Chriſt baptized no grown perſons.

Hinc jam illud eſt quod dixiſſe Dominum omnes tres memorant, talium enim eſt regnum Cœlorum. Non ſanè adultorum tantum, qui ut Infantes ſeſe humiliârunt quod Anabaptiſtæ contendunt. Hoc enim ſenſu quod dixerat ſibi Infantes apportandos eſſe, tanquam ſubjecta ratio minimè cohæreret, &c. Faceſſat igitur ſtulta iſta veſtra ſapientia; Sinite Infantes mihi adduci, aio enim non ſolum horum eſſe Regnum Cœlorum; ſed nullum omnino Regni hujus fore participem, niſi Infantibus his ſimilis evadat.

Si jam ad Eccleſiam pertinent, & ipſorum eſt Regnum Cœlorum, cur eis ſignum Baptiſmi, quo in Eccleſiam Chriſti, qui ad eam pertinent, recipi ſolent, negaremus? Siqui hœdi inter eos ſunt, tum excludendi nobis erunt, cum id eſſe ſeſe prodiderunt? intereane ſimus ſeveriores Chriſto ——— aut eſt noſtrum baptizare pluſquam

Domini

Domini amplecti, imponere manus & benedicere fuit? quæ fidei aut charitatis jactura, per Baptiſmum Chriſto adducere quos adduci ſibi juſſit?

Much more than this hath *Bucer* on *Mat* 19.13, 14,15. full of ſpiritual conſideration.

To this doth *Muſculus*, *Calvin*, *Beza* add their holy Teſtimonies: But I ſpare theſe quotations, becauſe it's *ad homines*, to men like our ſelves: Let theſe which diſſent read impartially, and conſider if this place ſhould ſtand alone, without any harmony of other Scriptures, whether there be not more in it for infant-baptiſm, than any thing they have againſt it: I would be ſo ingenious with them, as to deal with any of their awaked Conſciences.

CHAP. XI.

Wherein is conſidered the method of God in the Old Teſtament, of adminiſtring Ordinances in Families, and baptizing Houſholds in the New-Teſtament; and how far it contributes to Infant-baptiſm.

IT's not a ſlight thing to conſider, how that ever ſince the Fall this hath been an uſual method of God in adminiſtration of the Covenant, and priviledges of grace, to make it run through families and houſhoulds of Believers, as the ſpecial veins: Hence families, as they were the firſt natural ſocieties,

ſo

ſo they were the firſt Churches, the Covenant and the priviledges of it was among them; from *Adam* to *Abraham* it went on thus: And when the Covenant in *Abrahams* time came to be more expreſly opened, and fairer expounded, God goes on ſtill in the ſame method, makes the Covenant with *Abraham* and his houſhold; only the family was enlarged, it became a greater houſhold, according to the vaſtneſſe of the extent of the Covenant; yet ſtill it was diſpenſed as to a family. Now if you come to the New Teſtament, there you ſee God going on in the ſame method, as if he had caſt by an eternal decree this platform: Baptiſm, the New Teſtament Ordinance, is adminiſtred according to the ſame deſign to families and houſholds. Let us conſider what Chriſt himſelf ſaith to *Zacheus*, *Luke* 19. who was a Gentile, and one of the chief Publicans, upon occaſion of this mans converſion, to open the nature and continuance of the Covenant to the Gentiles in the ſame form as it was to *Abraham*; *This day is ſalvation come to thy houſe, for as much as he alſo is a ſon of* Abraham: Here is the ſame language uſed in adminiſtration of Circumciſion in the Old Teſtament; and the ſame reaſon, *for aſmuch as he alſo* (καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν) *is a ſon of* Abraham. What can be drawn from this place more proper than theſe concluſions?

1. That as ſoon as ever he was converted and believed, Chriſt applies the promiſe to his houſe; if there were not ſomething more in it, he would have

have onely said, *Salvation is come to thee.*

2. It's clear that he opens the Covenant made with *Abraham*; not onely to himself, but his house; and argues from his being a son of *Abraham*, that therefore the Covenant is not onely made with him, but with his house, that is, his seed: it were enough for to call him the son of *Abraham*, and to say, salvation is come to himself; but to mention his house, together with himself, and give this as a reason, because he is the son of *Abraham*, is as much as to say, the priviledges of the Covenant is the same to you and your house, as it was to *Isaac* and *Jacob*, *for asmuch as he also is a son of* Abraham, *as well as they*. Now for Christ to speak in this dialect, & to tell them of their households, and of favour to them in the beginning of the Gospel, and yet at the same time exclude their Infants from all outward signs of the promise, which they ever had in the darkest days of grace, is a strange policy, unsutable to the simplicity of Jesus Christ.

Concerning this continued method of God, though this *Zacheus* be a singular, yet he is not the onely example, if you read all along the *Acts of the Apostles*, these which had households, the promise runs with a gracious entail, *Acts* 11. 14. *Cornelius* hath the promise to him and his house. *Acts* 16. 15. *Lydia* was baptized, and her household. Ver. 31. the Apostle exhorts the Jaylor to believe, and he should be saved, and his whole house. Just as God made the Covenant with *Abraham*, *Walk before me, and be thou perfect*, Gen. 17. 1, 2, 7. *And I will be a God to thee,*

and thy ſeed, or houſhold. In ver. 33. its ſaid, he was baptized, and all his (*αὐτος καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ*) *he and all that were of him*; a moſt emphatical expreſſion to ſet forth his Children, who are the naturall off-ſpring, and who are properly a mans own; he changes the general phraſe of a houſe, which may ſometimes comprehend more, and comes more cloſe home; when he ſaith, he was baptized, he ſaith, all his (*αὐτοῦ*) of him, which cannot be meant of ſervants, who are our own as goods and lands are, but not of *a man*: but muſt firſtly and primarily refer to his Children, who are begotten of him; and it may be ſecondarily to his kindred; in the ſame phraſe you have it tranſlated, *Rom.* 16 10, 11. *The Houſhold of* Ariſtobulos, *the houſhold of* Narciſſus: but it is, *τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου, & τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου*; *Theſe of* Ariſtobulus *and* Narciſſus: which muſt eſpecially be meant of their Children, and theſe that deſcended from their loins.

The onely Objection is from the following v. 34. where it is ſaid, *That the Jaylor believed with all his houſe*; and ſo none were baptized but believers.

To which I anſwer, That is not a reſtriction or exception of all that were baptized, but a deſcription of the power the Word had upon all his houſe with himſelf; for he ſaid in the former verſe, that he was baptized, and with his thoſe which were begotten of him; and in this verſe he ſhews the actual influence of the Word on all his houſe likewiſe: So that the words are an after deſcription of the mighty work-

workings of the Gospel, not onely to himself, who was baptized and so his; but on all his house besides.

2. Others, and men of good account, do relate πανοικοι, *with all his house*, to the Jaylors rejoycing, not to his believing; and so read thus, *And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoyced, believing God, with all his house*; And it may be as well referred to the one as to the other.

However its very observable, That when he speaks of the Apostles preaching, and their believing, he names his house in the largest term; v 32. *They preached the Word to him, and all that were* (ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ) *to all that were in his house*: But when he speaks of baptizing, he saith (that you may be sure his Children were baptized) *that he, and all of him, or all his, were baptized.* Now he doth not say, *all that believed, but all* his *were baptized*: though there is no doubt but all that believed were baptized also.

But if there were no such emphaticall expression, as is by the holy Ghost in the baptizing of the Jaylors house; yet there is enough to make forth an example of Infant-baptism from the very notion of baptizing whole housholds, so frequent in the Gospell.

1. It will be very strange confidence to affirm that in all these houses there were no Infants, or little Children.

2. There is greater probability, and ſtronger grounds to believe, when he names houſholds, that there were little ones in them, than that there were not.

3. Eſpecially when the word, *houſe*, in all languages in the world is moſt uſually put for Children of the houſe, who maintain and keep it up: and ſo often in Scripture, *Gen.* 30.30. and 45.18,19. *N.* 3.15. *Pſal.* 115.12,13. 1 *Tim.* 5.8.

4. Where whole houſes are baptized, there Infants are not excluded, if they be in the houſe; and if not excluded, they are included; they cannot be excluded, for they are principal parts of the houſe; and if onely *adulti*, or grown perſons ſhould be meant, when Children are named, that would be to exclude Infants from being Children, as well as from being parts of the houſhold.

When *Abraham* and his houſe were circumciſed, *Abrahams* Children were the principal parts of the houſe; and they were firſt circumciſed, and then his ſervants, and all in his houſhold were circumciſed alſo, being profeſſors of the ſame faith; for *Abraham* had a godly family: Yet upon a different account; the one by vertue of *Abrahams* Covenant, which was made primarily with him and his Children, with all his family likewiſe, as they profeſt *Abrahams* faith, and ſerved *Abrahams* God; and ſo it may be eaſily conceived how whole houſholds were baptized in the new Teſtament, the Children as in the Fathers Covenant; the Servants and others by vertue

vertue of the ſame profeſſion: And in this ſenſe there will be no ambiguity in the phraſe of baptizing whole houſholds.

Laſtly, That the Apoſtle ſhould borrow an expreſſion alwaies uſed in the Old Teſtament to include Children eſpecially, and make uſe of it in the New to exclude them, would be ſtrange but to conjecture: Now when ever the houſhold is ſpoken of in the Old Teſtament, it alwaies includes Children. This is ſtill more for the baptizing of Infants, than any thing they can ſay againſt it; and compared with all the former Scriptures, may make up a full demonſtration to a judicious conſcience.

CHAP. XII.

Circumciſion and Baptiſm compared; that they have both one ſpiritual ſignification; the true nature of them both opened, and what influence this conſideration hath to prove Infant-Baptiſm.

IT'S well known among theſe that are againſt baptizing of Infants, what weight they put on that Ordinance of Baptiſm, that all other ſeem light in their eyes, and of no account in reſpect of that. When they ſpeak of Circumciſion, they uſually call that a carnal Ordinance, ſealing onely carnal and temporary things, and onely reaching the outward man; the one requiring onely the fleſh for its ſubject, the other a ſpiritual man, a new creature, &c. And ſo much

much do they idolize (for so I fear it's among many) Baptism, that even faith it self seems little without it: But that I may wash off this paint, and make Ordinances look like themselves, let us compare these ordinances together, and view them in their dignity, and worth, and significations. And,

1. In general for Circumcision; we all know how much it was prized among the Jews above all other Ordinances, and that it was the last that was taken away with the greatest difficulty: about which the Apostles had more ado, than about the taking away all the Ceremonies; whereby we may judge, the Jews did look on it as the great seal of all their priviledges; which when that was lost, all was lost. Read the Epistle to the *Romans*, chap. 2, 3. when he would speak all their outward priviledges at once, he saith, *What advantage hath a Jew? what profit of Circumcision, &c?* So in the *Galathians*, *Philippians*, *Ephesians*, *Colossians*, many chapters are spent to take them off from Circumcision.

2. Circumcision was that Ordinance which was immediately annexed to the Covenant, and a confirmation of it, *Gen.* 17. 7, 10. therefore called the Covenant.

3. It was an ordinance instituted long before the Legal and Mosaical Ceremonies of an elder date: It was not a type of *Canaan*, but of Christ to come in the flesh of the seed of *Abraham*, and of the circumcision of the heart, which Christ was most fully to perfect in the Gospel.

There

There is only one Gentleman that writ a Book of Baptiſm, printed in the year 1646. will have Circumciſion to be a type of Baptiſm, which cannot be: For,

1. Types muſt have ſomething in their outward face to repreſent another thing more eminent and real: Now Circumciſion hath nothing in the outſide to ſet forth Baptiſm.

2. It is not ſo handſom to make one outward ſign the antitype of another.

4. Circumciſion was as holy an Ordinance as Baptiſm in the New Teſtament; for they are both in themſelves outward acts and no holineſs more in one than in another, but as they have from inſtitution: onely Baptiſm is more eaſie to the fleſh than Circumciſion; and yet not more eaſie, if that way of dipping ſhould be the onely way of baptizing, eſpecially at ſome ſeaſons and to ſome bodies.

5. The N.T. gives as large and honourable characters of Circumciſion, as it doth of Baptiſm: thus the Apoſtle calls it in *Rom.* 4. *The ſeal of the righteouſneſs of faith*: A character ſo reſplendent and glorious, that the Goſpel can give no higher to an Ordinance. And as much as he ſaith of Baptiſm in effect. 1 *Pet.* 3 21. that baptiſm ſaves through the anſwer of a good conſcience, the contrary opinioniſts are put to hard ſhifts to avoid the ſtrength of this place; and therefore ſome would evade it thus, ſaying, That the Apoſtle doth not call it a ſeal of the Covenant or Promiſe, but of the righteouſneſſe of faith.

Sol. A miſerable evaſion! as if the righteouſneſs of faith were not included in the Covenant, or there were any righteouſneſs of faith but what comes by the Covenant, and ſo would make a ſeparation between the promiſe of righteouſneſs, and the righteouſneſs promiſed.

Others would cloath the Text with this diſguize, That it ſealed it onely to *Abraham*, whereas it was ſo to *Iſaac*, and *Jacob*, and *David*, and all that were in the Covenant.

This is held forth moſt clearly in that verſe.

1. That Circumciſion was a ſeal of the pure Covenant of grace, in which righteouſneſs was promiſed to *Abraham* and his ſeed indefinitely.

2. That this ſeal was applied to all the ſeed that were but externally and viſibly in Covenant, to Infants; and the ſame ſign that *Abraham* received upon profeſſion of his faith, his Child received; and therefore he is ſaid to be the Father of Circumciſion, as of Faith; ver. 12.

3. Doctor *Willet* from this place holds forth the ſameneſs of the ſubſtance of the Sacraments of the Old and New Teſtament, both which do ſeal the righteouſneſs of faith; and lays it as a great error on the Romaniſts, who affirm, That the Old Teſtament Sacraments did not exhibit the graces of the New.

4. This cannot be denied from the place, without men will willfully put out their own eyes, that Circumciſion had as glorious a uſe as Baptiſm, *viz.* to

ſeal

seal the righteousnes of faith; which must be as well to others that had the true efficacy of the Covenant, as to *Abraham* himself; and no higher mercy can any ordinance of the New Testament seal to any.

There were many other circumstantiall and accidental uses of circumcision according to the Jewish state, as we will grant Mr. *Tombes*, as,

1. To engage to the performance of the whole Law, *Gal.* 5.2,3. *Acts* 15.10.

2. To be a partition-wall between Jew and Gentile, *Eph* 2.14.

But when the Apostle would give circumcision his true character, and shew what the primary, and substantial use of it was, he calls it a seal of the righteousnes of faith.

6. Circumcision and baptism signifie one and the same thing, and so agree in being signs of the same grace; compare *Col.* 2.11,12,13. with *Rom.* 6.3 4. and 6. ver. circumcision signifies the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh; baptism is into Christs death, and to testifie the crucifying the old man with him, that the body of death might be destroyed, as by the comparing these two places it is most clear; and 3 v. and 6. v. of *Rom* 6. chap. onely baptism hath this larger consideration in it, as that it takes in Christs resurrection with it, and also the quickning of the soul together with him, which was not so fully signified in Circumcision, but implied, according as the Apostle argues in the same place, *Rom.* 6. v. 5. for if we have been planted in the likeness of his death,

we

we ſhall be alſo in the likenes of his reſurrection; the one being a conſequence of the other; and as circumciſion did cut off the foreskin in token of the deſtruction of ſin, ſo baptiſm by waſhing, ſignifies the taking away the pollution of ſin; thus God when he would promiſe to kill ſin, and work all grace, he expreſſeth it by circumciſion; *I will circumciſe thy heart, and the heart of thy ſeed.* Deut. 30. 6. And the Apoſtle *Phil.* 3. 4. ſaith, *We are of the circumciſion*, that is, we have the true work of grace in us.

The reaſon why I urge theſe conſiderations, is to hold for the capacity of Infants, as well for baptiſm as circumciſion; there is no reaſon why they ſhould be thought more unfit and incapable for the one than for the other: For,

Firſt, if Circumciſion were a ſeal of the righteouſneſs of Faith, and yet applied to Infants, and baptiſm can ſeal no higher mercy, why ſhould it be thought ſuch a ſtrange and unmeet thing to baptize them, more than to circumciſe them? they uſually ſay you put a ſeal to a blank in baptizing Infants; the ſame might be ſaid as to circumciſion; yet they were circumciſed as well as *Abraham* that profeſt his own Faith. I muſt acknowledge I never could yet underſtand why Infants ſhould be thought fit to have that ſeal applied to them in the Old Teſtament, which the New calls a ſeal of the righteouſneſſe of Faith, and yet be denyed it in the New Teſtament as incapacious, when Baptiſm can ſeal no more. I wiſh it were ſeriouſly conſidered;

Eſpecially

Eſpecially, Secondly, when Baptiſm ſhall ſignifie the ſame thing in ſubſtance, be both ſigns of the ſame grace; the one cutting away ſin as with a knife, the other waſhing it away with water; and yet Infants capable, and moſt fit to have the adminiſtration of the one ordinance, not of the other; if theſe of the diſſenting judgment, did with more ſobriety weigh ſuch conſiderations as theſe, they would not with ſo much fooliſh contempt write and ſpeak of Infants Baptiſm.

A knife may be applyed to an Infant, as to *Abraham*, though old, and in the height of his Faith, and ſeal the righteouſneſs of it; but water muſt onely be poured on actuall believers, and grown perſons, ſuch as *Abraham*, but not on Infants, though it hath no more to ſeal; as if there were ſome ſtrange excellency and vertue in the nature of water, that it were too precious to waſh the Infants of believers: For, if there be no more virtue in the water that baptizeth, then in the knife that circumciſed, you ſee there is no more glorious uſe of the one than the other. And what end God ſhould have to put ſuch a ſeal on Infants in the Old Teſtament, and exclude them in the New, when the Ordinances both ſignifie the ſame ſubſtantial grace, let any Chriſtian heart imagine.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIII.

That famous place, Colos. 2. 11, 12. *opened: the correspondence between Circumcision and Baptism further cleared.*

THe scope of the Apostle in the former verses is to dissuade the Christians from Jewish ceremonies, especially from Circumcision; and he doth it especially from the discovery of Christs fulness, and our being compleat in him; that is, you need nothing out of Christ now; but they object, we want Circumcision; he tells them they are circumcised in him, 11. v. where the Apostle distinguisheth of a twofold circumcision; one χειροποιητος, made with hands, the other ἀχειροποιητος made without hands, which he calls the circumcision of Christ, but it is wrought by him, and is by union with him; and you being circumcised in Christ, and have the grace signified by outward circumcision, you need no more; but there be two things they might object:

First, that this is nothing to the question: you would take us off from outward circumcision, by telling us we are inwardly circumcised, whereas the sign and the thing signified should alwaies go together: *Abraham* had this circumcision and others, and yet were outwardly circumcised.

Secondly, they might object we are not so compleat in Christ as *Abraham* and his seed; for, besides the inward grace, they had an outward sign and Seal to confirm it to them.

The

The Apoſtle in the 12. ver. anſwers both at once, they were not onely circumciſed inwardly, with Chriſts circumciſion, but there was an outward ſign in the New Teſtament to be applied to them, of the ſame conſideration; Buried with him in Baptiſm, &c. This is the ſumme of the words, let us now conſider what may be fairly deducted from them.

Many, and the moſt of our Divines, do conclude from hence the ſucceſſion of Baptiſm in the place or room of Circumciſion, that this Ordinance is appointed in the new Teſtament in lieu of the former, and for the ſame ends and purpoſes; which doubtleſs is true from this place, if men would truly weigh the import of the words, and not fight with their own ſhadows.

Firſt this compleatneſs in Chriſt is as well to enjoyment of Ordinances, and outward priviledges, as inward graces; elſe he would never have mentioned Baptiſm outwardly, when in the former verſe he ſpeaks of inward circumciſion; he would have kept ſtill in that ſtrain.

Secondly obſerve how he joyns them together, and makes them one, the inward circumciſion confirmed by the outward baptiſm, circumciſed with the circumciſion of Chriſt, buried with him in baptiſm; now this could not be proper, nor of any poſſible connexion, but by putting the outward ſign of baptiſm inſtead of the outward ſign of circumciſion; that is, you are circumciſed becauſe baptiſed; you change but the outward element, or inſtrument;

but

but the ſame inward grace is confirmed by both; thus the words are legible, and to be underſtood, without difficulty; but any other interpretation will be found moſt rugged, and unſuitable: For,

Thirdly, as the Apoſtle could not ſay in the former v. that they were circumciſed in Chriſt, but from the analogy between the outward ſign, and the inward grace; that is, if the outward ſign of circumciſion had not ſignified ſuch an inward work; ſo neither could he have found they were circumciſed in Chriſt, being buried with him in baptiſm, if that Ordinance of baptiſm did not as an outward ſign anſwer to that inward Circumciſion, and were inſtead of that ſign which did directly repreſent it formerly.

Fourthly, the nature of the Apoſtles deſign holds out this; for he would take them off the practiſe of circumciſion; and this he doth by diſcovering of another Ordinance, more ſuitable to the Goſpel, which ſhould ſignifie the ſame thing unto them, in a more large and emphaticall manner, ſignifying not onely Chriſts death, but his reſurrection; ſo that in the very import of the phraſe he cals baptiſm a Goſpel-circumciſion; and this argument he uſeth as moſt effectuall to take them off Circumciſion, by ſhewing them they were compleat in Chriſt in the New Teſtament, as to inward graces, and outward Ordinances, for though they were not circumciſed, they had baptiſm to ſupply the want of it with advantage, ſo that they ſhould not loſe an Ordinance, but exchange. *In whom you are circumciſed*, &c.

buried

buried with him in baptiſme; if baptiſm did not ſeal and confirm the inward Circumciſion, it could not be ſaid *Circumciſed in Chriſt, being buried with him in baptiſm*, and baptiſm could not ſeal inward circumciſion, but as it was of the ſame uſe with outward circumciſion, which did moſt directly ſignifie the circumciſion of the heart; and baptiſm held the ſame analogy, and was inſtituted to the ſame end; therefore its called the waſhing of regeneration. Suppoſe the Ordinance ſhould again be changed, and inverſion ſhould be thus, That baptiſm ſhould be aboliſhed, and circumciſion ſet up again, and the Apoſtle ſhould expreſſe himſelf after the ſame manner; intending to take them off the uſe of baptiſm, and to be circumciſed; and ſay ye are compleat in Chriſt, in whom ye are alſo baptized with the baptiſm of Chriſt, being circumciſed with him; would not the deduction be clear, that circumciſion was ordained inſtead of baptiſm, and to ſupply the defect of that Ordinance? the ſame concluſion muſt be according to the words as from circumciſion to baptiſm.

The ſumme of all is, That as inward circumciſion was ſignified by the outward circumciſion; the circumciſion made without hands, by the circumciſion with hands, as the proper and direct ſign of it; ſo is that inward circumciſion, as really and fully ſignified and confirmed by baptiſm: and that Ordinance is appointed to repreſent & ſeal that, as the outward act of circumciſion was formerly: ſo that circumciſion & baptiſm,

baptiſm, as to the thing ſignified, and the inward intent of their uſe, are made all one: elſe it will be very hard to make ſenſe of this place of Scripture.

The Pleas againſt this interpretation are of little worth, if weighed; ſome ſay its onely meant of the inward circumciſion, and inward baptiſm, which interpretation will ſerve us better than themſelves; for if inward graces, and of the ſame ſubſtantiall work be done on us, as circumciſed and baptized in Chriſt, it ſhews the oneneſs of the outward ſigns in the ſame ſignification.

Mr. *Tombes* ſaith in his *Examen* p. 93 That there is an analogy between circumciſion and baptiſm: yet ſaith it is rather between circumciſion and Chriſts burial, than between circumciſion and baptiſm, as *Chryſoſtom*, and after him *Theophylact* on the place.

All which will ſtill make out the truth of our interpretation; For,

First, if there be an analogie between them, as is, and muſt be granted, then there is ſome proportion and agreement between theſe two Ordinances; now its not in the outward adminiſtration, nor the external ſign, in that there is no proportion between a knife and water, and therefore it muſt be in the proper ſignification and reall uſe, which is the Apoſtles ſcope in this place: and therefore he expreſſeth the inward grace properly ſignified by the one Ordinance, and yet confirmed by the other; *Circumciſed in him, being buried with him in Baptiſm.*

2. If the analogy be between Circumciſion and Chriſts

Christs burial, not between it and Baptism, yet it will come all to one, yea, be our advantage: For

1. That shews that *Circumcision* did hold forth as much as Baptism; *viz.* Christs death and burial.

2. That when we are said to be buried with Christ in Baptism, & that is the outward sign to represent our burial with Christ, we are as if we were circumcised; Circumcision holds analogy with Christs burial, and so doth Baptism with both: And thus take it in what sense you will, the Text will clear it self.

CHAP. XIV.

A clear Explication of Mat. 28.19. *With* Mar. 16.15, 16. *wherein their argument from the first institution is opened and confuted.*

LEt us at length come to view that prime Text, *Matth.* 28.19. on which these that are against Infant-baptism lay the most weight: As from the very first institution of that Ordinance, Christ gives his Apostles there Commission to teach and baptize; *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the father, Son and holy Ghost.* Hence (μαθητεύσατε) which they translate, Disciple all Nations, and then baptize them, they argue, None are to be baptized by Christs institution, but these which are first taught, and so made disciples: But Infants are not capable to be taught, or to be made Disciples. *Ergo.* They may not be baptized.

That I may ſhew the errors of this argument, and ſo fully clear up the point, the terms with their connexion both in the major and minor propoſition muſt be examined from the words of the Text, and that parallel place, *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. which for methods ſake I ſhall hold forth in theſe following conſiderations.

1. For the word μαθητεύσατε we ſhall not much ſtand on, whether it be tranſlated to make Diſciples, or as it is in our common verſion, *Go teach all Nations*; for it is ſometimes a verb tranſitive; to teach by writing, or *viva voce*, with a living voice; and ſo it is to be taken here, ſaith learned *Whitaker De Script.* and moſt agreeable with *Mark* 16. 15. where he bids them *Go preach the Goſpell to every Creature.*

2. The ſtrength of the argument lies (if there be any ſtrength in it) on the abſolute ſuppoſed connexion between diſcipling and being baptized; therefore they ſay, None but theſe which are capable of teaching, are capable of Baptiſm; which is *Fallacia à dicto ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*, a Fallacy to take that abſolutely which is meant onely according to ſome reſpect. But to ſhew the idleneſs of the connexion;

1. You find preaching or teaching the Goſpel to be ſeparated as to the adminiſtration, and neceſſary and immediate connexion, by *Paul* himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 1. 17 *Chriſt ſent me not to baptize, but to preach the Goſpel*; ſo he ſaith in the former verſes, *He taught many, baptized few.*

2. Com-

2. Compare this with *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. which expounds this, you will finde believing and being Baptized as close connected to ſalvation, as here baptizing to Teach; *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* Now if any will ſtand on the order of words to prove an inſtitution, we may as well argue from *Mark*, as they from *Matthew*; None muſt be baptized but theſe which are taught; ſo none that believeth, and is not baptized, can be ſaved; and that baptiſm is as neceſſary to ſalvation as believing; for in order of phraſe they are abſolutely joyned together: And what a ſtrange inference would that be to make Baptiſm equall with Faith to ſalvation? and yet we have as much ground to argue from the one place ſo, as they from the other; without they will admit ſome other qualifying term to make it up.

3. The order of things is not always, or commonly ſo exactly expreſt in Scripture by the poſition of the words; for ſometimes one thing in the order of words is put before another, which in order of nature and conſideration is antecedent to it; as *Mar.* 1. 15. Repentance is put before Faith, *Rom.* 10. 9. Confeſſion with the mouth is put before believing with the heart, as to ſalvation; with abundance of other places of Scripture. Thus many things in the Evangeliſts are left out by one, ſupplied by another; and the ſame word directly uttered in one, inverted in another, eſpecially about the adminiſtration of the

Lords Supper. For to avoyd tediousnes, consult the places your selves. *Mat.* 26.26, 27. *Mar.* 14. 22, 23. *Luk.* 22.20. 1 Cor. 11.25.

3. A third consideration to open this Text in *Matthew*, is from comparing it once more with its parallel, *Mar.* 16.15. there it is, *Go preach the Gospel*, here it is *Teach and baptize*: Now hence it follows, that their teaching was by holding forth the Gospel: As much as if he had said, Open the Covenant, tel men the riches and fulnes of grace: Now if they must teach the Gospel, they must needs instruct them in the Covenant, which was to these that believed, and their seed. Now sutable to this Commission, *Peter*, when he comes to open the Gospel to the Jews pricked in their hearts, presently holds out the promise to them and their children, *Acts* 2 38, 39. and by that to make them both Disciples. So *Gal.* 3.13. The blessings of *Abraham* to come on the Gentiles, is one of the main parts of the Gospel. Now if they teach men Gospel, they must preach, as *Peter* did when he had converted the Parent, *The promise is to you and to your Children.* Thus in *Luk.* 1. 72. this is made one great end of Christs coming, *to perform the mercy promised to our Fathers, and to remember his holy Covenant*; so that preaching the Gospel is preaching the Covenant. Now that Infants are in the Covenant as well as grown persons, we have formerly proved.

4. This is no more than was required of *Abraham* at the time of Circumcision, and yet his Infants were

not

not excluded from the Ordinance. *Gen.*17. *walke before me, and be perfect Chap.* 18. 19. *Abraham* was to command his Children, and teach them to keep the ways of the *Lord:* and yet his Children were not to be kept from the ſign of the Covenant, until they were taught, & had walked before God in uprightneſs, as *Abraham.*

5. To come home to the word, in their own ſenſe, μαθητευσατε ſignifies *Make diſciples*; now Children are not capable of being made Diſciples, ſay they.

I anſwer, 1. Some have been made Diſciples before they were diſtinctly taught, as the twelve, whom Chriſt called, and they followed him, & became his Diſciples, and were real Diſciples, yet as ignorant as Infants, and were taught afterwards by degrees.

2. One is ſaid to be made a Diſciple even in vulgar phraſe, as well who is liſted in the School to be taught, as one that is teaching or already taught, though he hath not learnt a letter: Thus in all Schools it's a uſual phraſe at the firſt entrance of a Child, he is called a new Scholar, or a new Diſciple Thus Infants being entred into Chriſts School, and given up to be taught in time, and by degrees, may be accounted Diſciples; it was ſo in the former inſtance, & it's no ſtrange expreſſion in civil Schools.

3. Infants are expreſly called Diſciples in the New Teſtament, as well as grown and taught men: Thus *Acts* 15. 10. Circumciſion is called a yoke put on the neck of the *Diſciples*, that is, on Infants, who were

the ſpecial ſubject of that Ordinance, and bore the burthen of it, and not properly the Parents; and yet the Parents had the deep ſenſe of it reflecting on themſelves and their little ones, and therefore he calls it a yoke that they nor their Fathers were able to bear; eſpecially becauſe it did binde them and their children to keep the whole law; there is no evaſion of this; if they ſay it was meant of the Fathers, and of the doctrine of circumciſion, which did bind themſelves: yet they muſt grant the yoke was on their Children as to the act; and that if the doctrine was ſo burdenſome, much more the practice, which the poor Infants are under; and they are called indefinitely *Diſciples*, either by themſelves, or with their Parents; and the argument is thus: Thoſe were Diſciples on whom the yoke of circumciſion was laid; but on Infants was this yoke laid. *Ergo* Infants are Diſciples in the N. T. expreſſion. If you will make any diſtinction it muſt be in the manner of laying on the yoke, *viz* on the Parents doctrinally, on the Children actually: but there can be no reſtriction of the word, *Diſciples*, from theſe on whom that yoke was laid, as is expreſt in that Chapter. Conſider,

4. Let us come to the ſubjects to whom the Goſpel is to be preached: and they taught and baptized; it is in *Matthew*, παντὰ τὰ ἔθνη, *all Nations*; in *Mark* it is, *Preach the Goſpell*, πάσῃ κτίσει, *to every Creature*: Now that Infants ſhould be none of all the Nations, and excluded from being of this creation of God, who were included as ſpeciall ſubjects

when

when the Church was in but ſo ſmall a ſpot of the world, is from our narrow apprehenſions in the Goſpel-times of diſpenſation of *Grace*.

And the argument our Divines bring from this place is ſtrong and moſt conſiderable: The *Goſpel* is to be preached to every Creature, all Nations muſt be diſciples; but Infants are a part of this creation, are included in all Nations; therefore they muſt be made diſciples alſo. Read the Text again, *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations* (παντὰ τὰ ἔθνη) *baptizing them* (ἀυτὲς) which muſt needs refer to (τὰ ἔθνη) though the one be maſculine, the other the neuter; or elſe muſt relate to nothing, for it hath no Relative beſides to anſwer unto: This is very common in Scripture, and the ſame phraſes, as thoſe well know that underſtand the Greek in *Rev.* 2. 26, 27. *Chap.* 19. 15. there is ἔθνη with ἀυτὲς, as Mr. *Cobbet* of *N. E.* well obſerves. Conſult *Acts* 15. 17. and 26. 17. *Acts* 21. 25. *Eph.* 2. 11. Maſculines joyned with (ἔθνη) that ſignifies *all Nations*. Now are Infants none of the *Nations*, or none of the National creation which the Goſpel may reach? *God* forbid!

The words hold forth only the general commiſſion given to the Apoſtles after Chriſts death; which was an enlarging of their bounds, who were onely formerly circumſcribed in *Judea*, and charged not to go into the way of the *Gentiles*: But now the empale is broken down, they muſt preach the *Goſpel* to every creature, teach all Nations, and baptize them: but it doth not hold forth either the proper

ſubjects of baptiſm, or the form or manner of baptizing, which ſhould not be delivered (according to their own rule of inſtitutions) in general and indefinite terms, as, *Every creature, all Nations*; and by tranſitive words, as, *Preach the Goſpel to them, teach them*. If this be the prime inſtitution of baptizing, from which place they exclude Infants, when Chriſt uſeth ſuch univerſal and comprehenſive expreſſions; we ſhall deſire but to deal with them on their ground, and the ſame Text will ſerve to prove our poſitions more demonſtratively than theirs: And this Text ſhews, that Chriſt gave commiſſion to the Apoſtles and Miniſters to preach and baptize; but in what order to do it, or what ſhould be required to the qualification of the ſubject as abſolutely neceſſary, is not at all diſcovered in this Scripture; they muſt look for another Text to exclude Infants beſides this, elſe give up their confidence.

Either this place is the full and exact rule of inſtitution of baptizing, or not; if they ſay it is, then it would deſcribe the perſons, and the manner, the matter and the form of baptizing, and that in the uſual phraſe with other Scriptures: but here is only a general commiſſion to two great acts, *viz.* to preach, teach and baptize; and we may ſay in the ſame place, that whoever are outwardly taught, or do but hear the Goſpell (though they walk never ſo contrary) muſt be baptized; for the commiſſion is, Teach and baptize, nothing of the parties entertainment of it is mentioned in this *Mat.* 28. nor of

the

the qualification of the ſubject with any diſtinguiſhing character. If they ſay this doth not hold forth all the inſtitutions in every particular, as they muſt grant, then we may compare other Scriptures with this, to make out the full inſtitution, as theſe where Infants are mentioned with ſo much gracious conſideration, as hath been formerly expreſt.

CHAP. XV.

Concerning the ſignification and uſe of the word Baptiſm, *or to be baptized; the genuine Etymologie of it in the Old and New Teſtament; the places in the New Teſtament brought to prove it ſignifies to plunge the whole body, anſwered.*

THE confidence of theſe that differ hath been ſo great, that as they have excommunicated Infants from the capacity of ſuch a priviledge, which they had ſo old a title unto; ſo they have forced this only ſenſe from the word *to baptize*, that it muſt ſignifie to plunge the whole body under water; and deny that to be true Baptiſm, which is not ſo adminiſtred; and ſo make it as eſſential to the manner, as viſible profeſſion to the matter.

For clearing up of this miſt, I have diligently enquired into the propriety of the word, and its uſe in the

the Greek Translators of the Old and New Testament, which are the best guides in this case; and if we look narrowly, it will be very hard to find, & very seldome, that ever the word in Scripture is used for the total immersion of the body, or being absolutely under water.

The word (βαπτίζειν) signifies among all Writers both Heathen and Ecclesiastical, promiscuously to dip into, or wash with water, by pouring on of it, or sprinkling; & there is nothing more usual in the New Testament expression of it, than to hold forth any kind of washing; It's exprest in Authors by *madefactare, lavare, abluere*, to wet or wash: thus *Budæus, Scapula, Pasor* and *Grotius* do interpret the word, though they grant it is, & may be taken more strictly for immersion: but let the Scripture explain it self, *Mar.* 7. 4. it is used for the washing of hands, and and of cups, and beds and brazen vessels, and of tables; which is not by plunging them in the water, so much as washing them by the pouring forth of water on them; for so it is exprest, when they came from the market they durst not eat (ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίζονται) without they were baptized, that is, washed; which could not be their whole bodies, without both excessive trouble and danger, for which times and seasons must be observed. And besides this (saith the Evangelist) they retained many other things in custome, βαπτισμὸς ποτηρίων, &c. as the Baptism of cups, that is, *lotiones*, or the washing of cups; which may be as well done by pouring on water, as by plunging

plunging into water, & was and is usually done in all Nations. So in *Luk.* 11.38. the Pharisees wondred at Jesus (ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου) that he was not baptized before dinner, that is, did not wash. And *Heb.* 9.10. all the Ceremonial washings or sprinklings are called Baptisms; in a metaphorical sense it's used for the pouring forth of the spirit.

And further, when it is translated to dip, both in the Old and New Testament, it signifies commonly the least touch or tast of any thing that is liquid. So *Luke* 16.24 *Dives* begs that *Lazarus* might be sent (ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος) That he might baptize, or dip the top of his finger in water to cool his tongue; the least drop would have been prized by him: 1 *Sam.* 14. 27. *Jonathan* is said to dip the end of his rod in an hony-comb, that is, but to take a very little; and the word is (ἀνέβαψεν) so it is used in *Exod.* 12.22. *Job.* 13. 26.

But to put it out of question, that there needs no such rigidness; and in pressing this method of plunging, from the word *Baptism*, let us compare it with other phrases. When the Scripture would expresse a covering of the whole body under water, and so a submersion, or being wholly under water, it useth two other words, as different from baptizing, *viz.* καταποντίζεσθαι, and δύειν and δύεσθαι. Compare 1 *Cor.* 10.2. All the Fathers and the Israelites are said to be

Differt à δύειν, quod est profundum petere, & penitus submergi. Pasor. Lexic.

be baptized in the Cloud, and in the Sea; they had only the dewings of the Cloud, & the sprinklings of the water on them as they past through: But in *Exod.* 15.4,5. when he speaks of *Pharoah* and his Host, he doth not say they were baptized in the waters, but useth these two words κατεπόντισεν ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, *They were drowned in the Red Sea, submersi*; and he adds, *the depths have covered them*; and κατέδυσαν εἰς βύθον, ὥσει λίθος, *they sank*, or as the word is, *doused themselves into the bottom as a stone, while the Israelites were but baptized under the gentle droppings of the Cloud, and of the Sea.* And the very same distinction did the Greek Writers make between baptizing, and dousing, or casting under water; expressing by baptizing, to be in the water as a Bottle is, or Ship that is seldom or never wholly overwhelmed. And this appears most demonstratively to be their meaning by the verse of the Ancient Oracle of the *Athenians*, who well knew how to speak and distinguish Greek.

> Ἀστὸς βαπτίζῃ, δύναι δέτοι οὐ θέμις ἐστι.
>
> *Baptize or wash him*, utris instar, *as a Bottle in water, but do not drown him, or utterly plunge him.*

Whereby it plainly appears that the word (*to Baptize*) signifies any kind of washing, whether by sprinkling or pouring out of water, or diping into water; & that it is specially distinguished from these words that do signifie a total submersion; and these men do rack the word only to speak for plunging under

under water, excluding the usual & more common sense of it, which is to wash or cleanse.

But let us view the Scriptures which they bring for the maintenance of this signification, *Mat.*3.13.16, *Jesus after he was baptized, went straight wayes up out of the water,* (ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος) which may be translated, *he went up from the waters,* ἀπὸ signifying more properly *ab* then *ex, from* than *out*; and it is most suitable to translate it so, because all rivers, for most part, lie low, & in valleys, in coming to which we are said to descend, & coming from to ascend; thus when Christ ascended, in *Act.*1.9. *He was taken out of their sight, that is,* from their sight.

Of the like consideration is that other place, which they lay so much weight on for to hold forth plunging, *Act*8 36,37,38. of *Philip* & the Eunuch, it is said they *went both down into the water* (εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ) which may as well, and better be translated, *they went down to, or towards the water*; it seems they being on the upper ground, spied water below them, and so went down to it to be baptized, as it is a common phrase among us, to go down to the water-side.

But secondly, should we grant them this interpretation, that *they went both down into the water,* which is a straining of the words, yet it can never be proved from this, that their whole body was dipt all over; a man may go into the water, & yet not be over his shoes; & how can they prove by this place they went in any further, or how far they went; or whether *Philip* did not take up water, & poured it on him; or whether

whether he duckt him under water, or dipt only his head; nothing can be proved from this place; but if they conjecture one thing, we may another, with as much evidence. In the 107. Pſal. it is ſaid, *They that go down to the ſea in ſhips, ſee thy wonders*; when they go down into the ſea in ſhips, is the ſhip plunged all over? or are they under water in the ſhip.

Yet thirdly, it is evident that their going into the water, is diſtinguiſhed in the ſame ver. from the Eunuchs being baptized; they went down, or to (or according to their own mind) into the water, & he baptized him: ſo that the going into the water; take it for dipping & ducking, is not baptizing, but ſomthing diſtinct, another act; and if they will prove going down to the water, or into the water, in this place denotes the dipping of the whole body, then he muſt be dipt before he was baptized; for *Philip* baptized him after they went into the water.

Again, there is as much from this phraſe to prove *Philip* to be dipt as the Eunuch; and if dipping be baptizing, for the text ſaith expreſly, *they both went down to*, or *in the water*, if you interpret it after their own heart, that they both went into the water, *Philip* was as much in the water as the Eunuch; for there is no exception made, but both went in together, & who ſhould then baptize the Eunuch? if this ſeem to be an abſurdity to them, how can they from this expreſſion, in the ſevereſt acception, conclude the Eunuch was dipt? but they both went into the water together, ſeeing the Text ſpeaks as much of *Philips*

lips going into the water, as of the Eunuchs: But if we take it according to the first translation, that they went both down towards the water, there may be some reasonable account given how the one was baptized; which seems to be most propable, by pouring out water upon him.

If any one object further from the next verse, that they ascended out of the water, here is not (ἀπὸ as in the former place, but ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος) *out of the water* yet it will not at all help them; for it is said of them both, they came up out of the water, and it speaks as much of *Philips* dipping himself as the Eunuch; & you may as well argue that *Philip* was new dipt, as that the Eunuch was baptized by dipping, because they both came up out of the water; besides, one may be said very properly to come out of the water, if he put but his foot into it; and thus you see on what weak foundations these high structures of confidence and ridgidsnesse are built,

The third and most triumphant place, which they cry up, and adore for this manner of baptizing by dipping, is *John* 3. 23. *And John was baptizing in Ænon near to Salem, because there was much water there.*

If we consider impartially, here is but a Geographical description of this place, of its situation, nigh *Salem*, & of the benefit they had of water, in regard of the most places besides in the countrey, *Ænon* lying nigh the banks of *Jordan*; and whereas they lay

lay the weight on this, that he gives it as a reason, why *John* was baptizing at *Ænon*, because there was much water there, it may be a very good reason why he chose that place for the country to come in, and be baptized, because they might go many a mile in these hot countries, and not meet with a drop of water, and it was a great priviledge accounted to these places that banked on *Jordan*, that they had much water; but what argument is this to prove that *John* plunged all he baptized?

The argument according to their form must be thus; *John* baptized in *Ænon*, because there was much water; *Ergo*, baptizing is by dipping all the whole body: this is a dangerous and ominous way of arguing to those that deny consequences, and deductions, for to warrant duties without expres syllabical precept; I hope they will allow us the same priviledge of demonstration, when we say, whole houses were baptized, *Ergo*, Infants and Children, who are the pillars of a house; is not this more fair and probable, than that *John* plunged their whol body, because there was much water? There is none of our consequences for Infants baptism so strained and far fetcht, as we have demonstrated formerly, it was necessary for them that had so many of several parts to baptize, to go where there may be much water, when they could get hardly a drop many miles round about, and yet not immerse every one they baptized; you may in *England* go 20. miles in some countries, and not finde a river to plunge a mans whole body under

under the water, what would it be in *Spain*, & the other hot countreys, where water is sold as wine and beer with us, how far might they go ere they could get a river to plunge themselves in? Thus you see how little reason they have from these scriptures to be so peremptory and rigid, as to make the essence of baptism to be dipping, or plunging all the body.

The last pretence commonly urged for this dipping, is from the analogy it hath with Christs burial, from that *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. *Buried with him in baptism*; hence say they, it is clear one must be dipt under water, else it will not represent a buriall. In this they put all their confidence, and therefore let us seriously view their strength.

Sol. First, let it be considered that they still make use of consequences, to prove institutions, which they will not allow us.

But more particularly, 1. Plunging the whole body into the water, doth not hold similitude, neither with Christs burial, nor the manner of burials in the most part of the world; for first, for Christs buriall and the manner of it, was not by throwing under the earth, for Christs body was wrapt in a linnen cloth by *Joseph*, and laid in a Tomb, or Sepulchre, hewen out of a rock, for that was the custome of the Jews, *è rupe specum excavare condendis corporibus*: Matt 27. 60. *To cut out a place like a cave*, or den, *out of a rock, to lay their dead bodies in*, as is observed by a man of great learning, and diligence: thus when we sleep in our houses, we may be said to be buried, having something over our heads.

Secondly, the manner of burying in *Europe* is not by plunging the body into a pit of duſt, but by caſting duſt or dung on the perſon: ſo that their pouring out water on an Infant as a paſſive ſubject, ſeems more to anſwer the ſimilitude of burying, than the caſting into the water, wherein there is ſome motion of the party himſelf contributing to his baptizing.

Thirdly, no man is ſaid to be buried who falls into the water, or under the earth, without he ſtay there ſome conſiderable time.

Fourthly, we are ſaid to be buried with Chriſt in baptiſm, in regard of the ſpiritual union we have with Chriſt in his death, and burial; and this is as much ſignified by pouring water on a perſon (as earth on a dead body) as well, I ſay, as by plunging.

Let us now conſider what remains to be ſaid againſt this abſolute rule, as they would make it; you have ſeen all their main places for plunging, with what demonſtration, at the beſt *ex probabilibus & incertis*, out of probable and uncertain conjectures, which they ſo much tax us withall, and yet the eye ſees not it ſelf.

Let us now go on, and conſider what other places of Scripture ſpeak more direct to qualifie this rigid opinion of plunging.

When *John* began firſt to adminiſter his office, it is ſaid *Mat.* 3. 5. *That Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and all the regions round about Jordan went forth to* John, *and were baptized of him in Jordan:* A man had need have

good

good ſtore of confidence to perſwade himſelf & others, that all theſe people were baptized by plunging their whole body into *Jordan*, or that they were dipt in their cloaths, or came with any prepared garments for that purpoſe; all which are neceſſary circumſtances to be conſidered; doubtleſs they were many thouſands that came forth, for the denomination is from the greater number; all *Judea* and *Jeruſalem*, &c. that is, a very great many, or the greateſt number of theſe Inhabitants; and how they could be thus baptized, men & women, in their cloaths promiſcuouſly, or how they could get garments ſo ready as to make the act decent, or what places they could have, ſeeing there were ſo many, for the women & the men, to prepare themſelves for the comely adminiſtration of ſuch an Ordinance, I cannot imagine: we hear *John* baptized ſo many, but in what manner is uncertain; & that which is ſo hotly contended for moſt improbable, all things duly conſidered.

The like is of that, *Act.* 2. 41. where 3000. were baptized in one day by the Apoſtle, which if it were performed by plunging, could not but be accompanied with the like inconveniences: ſo that it is only ſaid they were baptized, not how; and the word, as you have ſeen, is not ſo ſtrictly to be appropriated to dipping, but admits of a more large ſignification.

Firſt, of the ſame conſideration is that place, *Acts* 8. 12. where it is expreſly ſaid, that men and women were baptized together, & on a ſudden, which can

hardly be conceived how it could be done with that gravity the Goſpel requires, by plunging in their own proper habits; and ſuch ſuoden acts could not be done with ſuitable preparations of garments.

But to come to particular inſtances, and parallel them together with former places, which are brought to prove this kinde of dipping; and let us judge which hath more demonſtration. *Acts* 9. 18. *Paul* was baptized in the houſe of *Judas*; there is nothing of a *Jordan* or *Ænon*, a river that he was carried unto; neither can they by any thing prove that *Paul* was thus dipt, but only their good will to have it ſo; neither is it probable that every houſe had a deep pond belonging to it, or a river running through it, or ſo vaſt a receptacle or ciſtern to hold water as to plunge a mans whole body in it.

Secondly, conſider the Jailors caſe, *Acts* 16. 33. he was baptized in the priſon, and at midnight, he and his houſe; he waſhed their ſtripes, and they waſhed him in token of remiſſion of ſins.

All that the moſt rational and profound critick of that judgment can ſay, is onely this; That it may be ſuppoſed he had ſome great veſſel, which ſome had in theſe hot countries for waſhing themſelves in, and ſo made uſe of it himſelf to be baptized; but what a poor ſuppoſition is this? there is nothing either in the text, or from reaſon to countenance it; who can imagine that in theſe hot countryes, where water is ſo ſcarce and precious, a poore Jaylor ſhould have ſuch a veſſel of ſo large and vaſt a continent, which muſt

coſt

toſt much; or that the State would provide ſuch a veſſel in the Priſon to bathe and refreſh Priſoners, who are under ſuſpition, or cenſures of all ſorts of crimes againſt the State? but no more of that; its too groſs to conceive: And why may not we as well argue thus; The Jaylor was baptized late in the night in the Priſon; *Ergo*, not by plunging, but waſhing or pouring out water on him, as they argue from *Joh.* 3. 23. *John* was baptizing in *Ænon* near *Salem*, becauſe there was much water there; *Ergo*, he baptized by plunging; I leave it to any ſober judgement to determine; if the one prove that baptizing may be by dipping, the other proves it may be by ſome other way.

Thus you ſee the ſcripture is not ſo peremptory as theſe men are, but hath left the method of baptizing in general, and under a latitude: Neither can they bring one expreſs place which holds it forth either in precept or preſident (which they call for from us to ſhew them for our judgement, and will not be ſatisfied in all other conſiderations) and have no more but conjectural conſequences to prove their abſolute determinations, but what their confidence ſupplies: And if there be any abſolute need of dipping, it is to cool the heat of theſe mens ſpirits, who deny Baptiſm to be true, becauſe they have not been plunged.

The ſum of all is this; They affirm the word, *To baptize*, ſignifies only immerſion, plunging or dipping the whole body under water; we deny it, and ſhew

that it ſignifies to waſh by pouring on water, and more often in the Old and new Teſtament; and that when this word is uſed in the Scripture, its oppoſed to other words that ſignifie properly douſing, or caſting under water: And I think I may ſay it, without too much raſhneſs, that they can hardly bring one explicit place in the Old or New Teſtament, where the word, *To baptize*, is uſed poſitively for plunging or douſing under water; and doubtleſs the moſt of that judgement know not what the meaning of the words are, elſe they would not lay the eſſence of Baptiſm on a word of ſuch a large uſe.

The Scriptures being thus cleared, to ſpeak at leaſt, that plunging is not abſolutely neceſſary to conſtitute the truth of Baptiſm: Let us now come to conſider the morality of this judgement, and the practical conveniencies or inconveniencies of this way of plunging; for if it be the only and pure Goſpel-way, it will have no ominous or uncomely aſpect on other rul s, which are from the ſame authority, nor any way aſperſe the Goſpel.

1. I know not how to believe that Chriſt would ordain any Ordinance, and tye ſouls ſtrictly to it, that cannot be practiſed univerſally by all, and but in ſome places, & at ſome ſeaſons, without manifold inconveniencies and dangers unto nature: For if only dipping ſhould be baptizing, & every one that believes ought preſently to be baptized, how ſhall they do that live in thoſe hot & dry Countryes where water is ſo ſcarce, as it is in many places of the world,

world, who must be forced to go so many miles to come to a River, and yet may only find it a small Brook, with which they can hardly wet their feet in passing over, as it is in many places of the world?

And if there were in every place never so much water, yet how dangerous is it for some bodies who are rheumatick, & subject to Catarrhs & defluxions. in the winter-time (for no season should hinder a man from the practise of an Ordinance) in cold & wet to be plunged into the water? it were enough to beget diseases in the most healthy bodies; Christ is more tender of the bodies of his Saints, than to put them into such hazards; and I hope no one will conceive baptism to be a charm to prevent all inconveniences & diseases on the body: yet the zeal of these of that way carries on so furiously, that they think its impossible for them to get any hurt, though they plunge themselves into the water in frost & snow: but its dangerous to tempt God out of his ordinary way of preservation, when there is no absolute necessity for such a practice. Besides, this Ordinance would be a greater yoke and burthen than Circumcision, if this rule of theirs should be so universally followed; for there was no danger to the child by that act, though it seemed bloody and hard: But if all persons (for none are excluded by any weakness or indisposition) should be thus baptized, how eminent a danger would many be in? And if it prove so hazardous to the bodies of many healthy ones, that have in winter-time but acci-

dentally fallen into the water, though they have not been under water, that it hath coſt them their lives, the violence of cold ſo piercing their bodies and animall ſpirits (of which we have many experiences) how would it be for others, who labor under daily weakneſſes? And there is no promiſe that the water ſhall have no power to hurt thoſe which after this manner are baptized, no more than others. Fleſh and blood is the ſame in all, which is the immediate ſubject of ſuch an act; and God doth proportion his Ordinances to keep correſpondency with his other rules of mercy, and preſcriptions for uſe of means. In a word, if this be the onely way of baptizing, happy are thoſe that live in hot Countreys, or have bodies of braſſe.

Its ſaid, if it be an Ordinance, God will preſerve; but that is the queſtion; and that which demonſtrates it, is not the onely way; if it be a way at all, it is, That it croſſeth Gods rules for preſervation of a mans ſelf; the practice of it at ſome times being a kinde of a decree of ſelf-murther, and very unſuitable to the laws of mercy and tenderneſs, that command the very heart of Chriſt; and ſuch an abſolute unqualified command doth not look like an Ordinance of the Goſpel: For if baptizing be immediately to be practiſed after believing (according to their principles) then what ſhould hinder water that they may not be baptized? Suppoſe they be ſick and weak, ſuppoſe the ſeaſon be unſuitable, and yet the ſoul deſires to be baptized? You muſt either go againſt all rules

of

of nature to plunge that person, or else find out some other way of baptizing; or else a Gospel command must be neglected; for there is nor precept nor president of delay of that Ordinance (still to their own positions) in all the New Testament; and so both the baptizer and baptized must sin in performance of a duty, for the one sins if he by any pretence destroys his own health; and the other sins in being an instrument in it. I wish men were considerate of the nature and effects of these things; which if it were more commonly practised, we should have heaps of instances to make good this consideration.

2. Its very much to be observed, that Christ who hath bid us avo'd all appearance of evill, should ordain any Ordinance wherein there must needs be some such appearance fit for flesh and blood to act on; I have so much modesty as only to present this; how women, take it in what habit you will, can be baptized publikely, where all may come with men, and by men, without appearance of evil. And if the Apostle would have women to be vailed or covered in the Congregation, because of the Angels, take it either literally or tropically, to shew the modesty of Church-Assemblies, and to prevent any shadow of temptation; how can we think that its sutable to Apostolical rule, that women should appeare in the open ayre, out of their wonted habit, in a garment next to nakednesse, and so be plunged into water? But I am loth to enter into these secrets.

I onely propound this, Whether or no that this baptism

baptiſm by plunging, be not rather a baptizing of mens cloaths, and upper garments, than of the body, if the perſon baptized be not naked? and if he or ſhe be, how odious a cuſtome would that be? I cannot but think that that part that is baptized, ought to be naked, that the water may immediatly fall on that place; elſe ſomething elſe muſt be baptized primarily, & the fleſh ſecondarily and by conſequence.

This is the reaſon why we onely poure water on the face, becauſe its the principalleſt part wherein the image of God moſt appears, and the ſoul ſhines forth moſt eminently, on which all the workings of mens humors and affections leave the viſibleſt impreſſion and ſymptomes. And its obſervable, that the ſame word in the Greek (πρόσωπον) ſignifies both the face and the perſon, becauſe the whole perſon is repreſented by the face. And thus we baptize the perſon in baptizing his face, which we can look on, and waſh naked, and not be aſhamed. Let theſe men that are ſo zealous for dipping and plunging the whole body, conſider from all this, what warrant they have from Scripture for their ſo much rigid confidence.

CHAP. XVI.

An explication of that place, Heb. 10. 22. *About waſhing the whole body with pure water; the improper application of it to their manner of baptizing by plunging the whole body.*

AFter all ſtraining and ſhifts of the Antipedobaptiſts, this place in *Heb* 10.22. is forced in to give evidence for that manner of baptizing, formerly ſo much contended for. *Let us draw near with a true heart in full aſſurance of faith, having our hearts ſprinkled from an evill conſcience, and our bodies waſhed with pure water*; from hence they infer baptizing muſt be by dipping and plunging, or waſhing the body throughout.

Let us review it with its context, and we ſhall find they chew but upon a dry bone. For,

Firſt, the ſcope of the Apoſtle in all this chapter, is not in the leaſt to diſcover the manner of baptizing, but to open two things.

1. The fulneſſe of the ſatisfaction and merit of Chriſts offering himſelf, and being a ſacrifice for remiſſion of ſins, in oppoſition to all Legal, and ſhadowy offerings, as appears from the 1. v. unto the 29, which was begun to be demonſtrated in the former chapters, eſpecially the 9. chap.

2. To encourage ſouls in their approaches to God on ſuch a glorious account now in the New Teſtament,

ment, ſo in the 19. ver. *Having therefore boldneſſe* (παῤῥησίαν) *or freedom, to enter into the holieſt by the bloud of Jeſus, by a new and living way, &c.* In this 22 v. he bids them draw nigh with a true heart, and full aſſurance of faith, &c.

Secondly, that his ſcope or intent is not to open the manner of baptizing, is evident; for he writes to thoſe that were baptized already, as theſe Hebrews were; for you have no controverſie in this Epiſtle about circumciſion and baptiſm, as in the *Rom. Gal. Phil. Coloſ.* but onely concerning Chriſts prieſtly Office, eſpecially compared with the Levitical, Aaronical Prieſthood, and the vertue of Legal-ceremonial ſacrifices, and the ſacrifice of Jeſus Chriſt as High-prieſt, as any one that runs may read; now either they muſt ſay theſe were not baptized before, or elſe muſt conclude that his deſign is not to inform them (and that ſo tranſiently) of the nature or manner of adminiſtring of that Ordinance.

Thirdly, the Apoſtle here doth directly inſtruct the ſoul how to make confident addreſſes to God, *viz.* from the ſenſe of our juſtification and ſanctification together; for ſo by our hearts being ſprinkled from an evil conſcience is meant, & can be meant no other than Chriſts bloud ſprinkled on our ſouls, in the aſſurance of our abſolution from ſin, and the waſhing with pure water no more (but by this outward expreſſion) of the purity of our converſations, as to ſanctification, that we may not come with ſcandal of external unholineſs, when we pretend to be juſtified by Chriſts bloud.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, the usual word is here left out which expresseth that Ordinance; and it is your bodies not baptized but washed (λελουμένοι) which is a clear allusion to that of *Lev.* 16. 4. from whence it seems to be excerpted: when *Aaron* the high Priest was to enter into the holy place, and before he was to be attired for that work, it is said, *He shall wash his flesh in water, and so put them on*; the 70. translate the words thus, λούσεται ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, *He shall wash his whole body with water*, to signifie the holiness he should have in his person, as from external publick pollutions; the very same intent of the Apostle is here, that if we would be confident before God, when we approach unto God, we must come with Christs bloud on our consciences, and no known pollutions on our conversations; and if we will follow their grounds from comparing these two places, we may conclude that baptism was as much an Ordinance of the Old Testament, as the New, for washing; the body was used in both.

Fifthly, its a usual phrase in scripture to express the sanctification of our persons from inward and outward defilements, by the washing of water and washing the body, and yet not in the least to hint out the manner of baptizing by water, as into the special administration of that Ordinance; thus in *Esa.* 1. 16. when God saith to his backsliding people, wash you, make you clean; must he needs mean, go and be baptized? but that outward expression is put for the reforming of their waies, and expounded by put-

ting

ting away the evill from their doings or works; thus in *Joh.* 13. Christ expresseth justification and sanctification, by washing in general, and then washing the feet; he that is washed, (which is not baptized; for Christ saith he must wash or else *Peter* could have no part in him; and Christ did not baptize) such a one need no more but to wash his feet that is, walk holily; so that here is washing, and washing of the feet, and yet neither meant of baptizing with washing: Thus likewise in the *Corinthians* it is said, as to their sanctification, *Now you are washed, now you are cleansed, now you are justified*; he means not Now you are baptized, but of the speciall purification of their hearts, and lives from their former pollutions of flesh and spirit; which though signified by baptism, yet so remotely, as no man can gather the constant method of external baptism from it.

Sixthly, he saith your bodies washed (λελουσμένοι) with clean or pure water; now I hope as to baptizing, none are so fooliſh as to stand on it, whether they be baptized after a rain when the water is puddled, or whether only in pure & chrystal streams, from an unpuddled spring or ocean; and yet they must be tied to the one as the other, if this Text be their president; and we may as well question from this Text, whether they be rightly baptized, if there be any mud, or slime or filth in the water, as whether we be baptized, if all our bodies be not washed; but now this expression to set forth holinesse and sanctification, is most apt and full of life: our hearts and

conver-

converſations in drawing nigh unto God, ſhould be, as if externally they were waſhed with clean water, tranſparent and ſpotleſs before him, ſhining with an evangelical brightneſſe, and ſpirituall purity: for it will be very hard to draw nigh to God with a good conſcience, and a tainted and beſmeared body or converſation, with unholy acts, whereby God is ſo much diſhonoured; eſpecially to come, as the Apoſtle ſaith in the former part of the verſe, *with a true heart and full aſſurance of faith.*

Seventhly, if he had meant by this waſhing of the body, baptizing, he would not have made ſuch a diſproportion (according to their own rule) between the ſign and thing ſignified; for he ſpeaks of the heart being onely ſprinkled, and yet the body waſhed with clean water; now if baptiſm doth not ſignifie and ſeal juſtification, as well as ſanctification, it is not a ſeal of the Covenant of grace; and if it do ſignifie, it cannot go beyond the thing ſignified in expreſſion and outward repreſentation. And if Chriſts blood in *Heb.* 12.24. be called the blood of ſprinkling, and it be one of the main things ſignified and ſealed in baptiſm; well may we anſwer it by an outward act, without offence or ſin.

Eighthly, grant that by waſhing the body is meant baptizing here (which you ſee cannot be extorted by violence, or extracted by any chymical vertue) yet it will not ſerve their turns: For,

Firſt, the body is ſaid to be waſhed, when any one or more of the principall parts in ſight or uſe, are

are washed; and what is done to any eminent or commanding part, it carries the denomination of the whole with it; for *Maries* anointing and washing of Christs head and feet in *Luke* 7.44,45. is interpreted in *John* 11.2. for the anointing of the Lord, as much as if she had done it to all his body throughout; though it is onely expresst in the former place of the anointing and washing his head and feet. This is most usuall in Scripture.

Secondly, if they will go to the strictness of the term of washing the body; then,

First, it must be washed naked, or else it is not a washing of the body

Secondly, It must not be a bare dipping or plunging into water, but some other act must be done with the body, *viz.* a rinsing or rubbing, as we do pots or cloaths which we wash, which are not said to be washed, because dipt under water, but so rinsed as the filth and dirt is taken out; I only urge this to shew inevitable inconveniences these men will bring on themselves by such interpretations of Scripture.

Many other considerations might be added, if this Tract would bear the weight of them.

Chap.

CHAP. XVII.

A ſhort ſumming up of the former principles, and arguing them from the method of the Apoſtle Peter *about thoſe he baptized,* Acts 10.47.

THat we may bring up all to a full concluſion, let that place be conſidered, *Acts* 10. 47. and the manner of the Apoſtles arguing in it, which is moſt ſpecial to what we would prove; his argument lies in this, *They have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we: Ergo,* what ſhould hinder water? where there is a qualification, there may be an adminiſtration of that Ordinance; this is grounded on a common principle; now if we obſerve,

Firſt, the Apoſtle changes the uſual expreſſion, and ſaith not, *Seeing they have believed as well as we,* but *ſeeing they have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we, what ſhould hinder?* The argument is from the equivalency of the qualification; for whereas he ſaith all along formerly, *they believed & were baptized*; and to the Eunuch, *Act.* 8.37. *If thou believeſt thou maiſt*; but here, *ſeeing they have received the holy Ghoſt as well as we*; This change of phraſe ſhews the qualification not to lie in one term or expreſſion, but in the univerſal equality of Goſpel-manifeſtation, to ſome one way, to ſome another; that if any tittle in the Goſpel can be found properly, either by God's

promiſe or our judgement, applicable to any perſon, we may ſay, What ſhould hinder water? now to receive the holy Ghoſt, is the largeſt and moſt vaſt expreſſion, as to a qualification, that ever could be mentioned, taking in both real graces and all external gifts and priviledges, which are all conveyed by that holy Spirit, whether common or ſpecial, as is before expreſt in another Chapter.

We ſhall deſire on the Apoſtles account to argue from all theſe pregnant Texts of Scripture concerning Infants; and having the ſame premiſes we ſhall not certainly draw a wrong concluſion, when we find the Scriptures giving ſuch titles to Infants, and ſo many ſpecial carriages of Chriſt to them, which amounts to as much as is ſpoken of any that were baptized, why may not we ſay with *Peter*, *What ſhould hinder water?* as for inſtance,

If Infants be in the Covenant, that *Abrahams* promiſe belongs to them, as we have proved, *What ſhould hinder water?*

If Infants be holy, *What ſhould hinder water?* Theſe which are viſible Saints may be baptized; but ſo are the Infants of believers; for they are called (ἅγια) 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. The ſame name given to denominate all Saints; now to be holy is as much as to be a believer, as to receive the holy Ghoſt is made all one with being a believer; and what then ſhould hinder water?

So again, when the Gentiles and their poſterity are ingraffed into the ſame root, *Rom.* 11. which is *Abraham*

Abraham and the Covenant, and the branches holy as the root, what ſhould hinder water?

If Chriſt was angry when Infants were forbidden to come to him, and charged his diſciples to ſuffer them to be brought, who can forbid water? eſpecially when Chriſt took them up in his arms, laid his hands on, & bleſſed them, which is as much & more than is done in baptiſm, what ſhould hinder water to be caſt on them? and ſo we may argue from every place in the former diſcourſe, upon this very principle; for the Apoſtle argues neither from precept nor example, but from a parallel qualification, becauſe they had received the holy Ghoſt; & ſurely all theſe places of ſcripture concerning Infants, will fully amount to make up an equivalent qualification in them to a viſible profeſſion of grown perſons, & ſo we may argue on the ſame ground with Peter; beſides Infants are capable of receiving the holy Ghoſt as well as grown perſons, and why not capable of water? if they ſay it is only a viſible believer, a viſible profeſſor that is the ſubject; We anſwer,

You ſee the Apoſtle uſeth ſeveral expreſſions about it, ſometimes actively, ſometimes paſſively, ſometimes if thou believeſt; here ſeeing they have received the holy Ghoſt, but never ſaith a viſible Saint, or a viſible believer, or one that actually profeſſeth; and ſo may we ſay, ſeeing the promiſe is to them, ſeeing they are holy, ſeeing they are called Diſciples, ſeeing they had Chriſts hands laid on them, and were bleſſed, ſeeing they are capable of receiving

the holy Ghoſt, what ſhould hinder water?

Queſt. If they ſay ſtill there is no command; I anſwer,

Firſt, there is as much as is ſaid of others that were baptized.

Secondly, there is no command in terms from Chriſt or his Apoſtles to baptize profeſſing believers, or thoſe that ſhould receive the holy Ghoſt; yet they were baptized.

Thirdly where there is parallel characters to ſhew qualification, there may be the ſame outward ſign applied; on this principle the Apoſtle reaſons in this Scripture; it is only to be wondered how ſo many direct places of Scripture, which cannot but ſparkle in the conſciences of thoſe which are diligent and diving into truth, can be ſo lightly evaded and made nothing of, while men pretend to ſearch truth impartially without deceit or guile.

CHAP. XVIII.

Wherein is ſhewed who is to adminiſter this Ordinance of baptiſm, according to the rule of the Goſpel.

AS theſe that are contrary to Infant-Baptiſme are ſtrict & moſt ſevere in other circumſtances, which they think muſt be in that Ordinance, ſo they are moſt ſlight and rude in their conſiderations and practiſe, as to the adminiſtrator of that Ordinance, making every male diſciple, or any one that can give

an

an occasional word of exhortation, the minister of this Ordinance, which they do otherwise shut up, as in the most holy place, and put the very substance of the Gospel in it; this is unsutable to the Gospel, and makes baptism one of the poorest and lowest Ordinances, and of no such solemnity, seeing every Disciple may baptize another, and he that can speak any thing of the Gospel may do such an act.

But if we trace the rule, we shall see, that as it is an Ordinance of publick cognizance, so it must be administred by a publick Officer, who hath received commission authoritatively from Christ and his Church, and that it was never administred by any one but he that was either ordinarily, or extraordinarily called thereunto; begin with *John* the Baptist, so called from his work and designment to the administration of that Ordinance; he was extraordinarily called, as the propheſies of him witness, with the circumstances of his birth and behaviour, *Luke* 1, 7. &c. *Matth.* 3. 1, 2, 3.

All the time of Christs ministry, his Disciples by immediate commission from himself baptized, and none else: and we all know how they were called, and who gave them power.

When Christ gave up all his power and authority to be continued to the end of the world, or his second coming, *Mat.* 28. *Go teach all Nations baptizing them*, and gave them their general & publick commission, he gave it to these that were to be Apostles, and to these that should succeed them in ordinary,

and as by ſetled commiſſion, not to every one that ſhould be made a Diſciple; this was a commiſſion to them at large, and yet appropriated to ſuch an order, without we will ſay all are commiſſioned to teach and baptize.

Afterwards, when the Goſpel-order of Churches came to be ſetled, & particular inſtructions given, as to the foundation and method of adminiſtration in Churches, it was never adminiſtred by any but thoſe that were for the time extraordinary, or ordinary ſetled Officers of the Church, whoſe names are ſummed up in 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29. and *Eph.* 4. 11. Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers; beſides theſe, none have office or power to ſuch adminiſtration but onely theſe.

Thoſe that are the more ſober and intelligent ſort of our oppoſites, grant us this, that the adminiſtration of baptiſm is of publick cognizance; and that ordinarily it muſt be adminiſtred by thoſe which are in publick and ſet office; but generally every brother among them of any ſuppoſed gift may be a baptizer.

As for *Philip* and *Ananias*, who baptized, the firſt was an Evangeliſt, an extroardinary officer, as the Apoſtles, raiſed & inſpirited, & impowered much after the ſame manner; and if we conſult with *Acts* 8. he had ſpecial commiſſion and authority from heaven, by a Divine call, to perform that act on the Eunuch; and ſo far *Ananias* who baptized *Paul*, as one of their own judgement ſaith well, he was deputed

in

in an extraordinary manner to that miniſtery, *Act.* 9. the Lord appearing to him in a viſion; and theſe examples cannot be drawn into an ordinary rule, without the ſame circumſtances be found uſual.

And it muſt needs be ſo that none but one of the ſetled officers of the Church, who is to preach the Goſpel, may be a baptizer.

Firſt, becauſe it is a Church-Ordinance; Chriſt hath now left the keyes to the Church, ſet in the Church ſucceſſively ſuch perſons, who are actually to adminiſter all Ordinances in it; and if it be a Church-Ordinance, only theſe may adminiſter it who are called to one of theſe offices in the Church; all grant this that it is a Church-Ordinance, though ſome take the Church more largely, others more ſtrictly.

Secondly, it is an act of power to baptize, *Mat.* 28. *All power is given to me in heaven and earth, Go teach & baptize*; now power is conveyed by a ſpecial commiſſion and call. For a man to exerciſe a gift of knowledge by utterance, needs no ſuch ſolemnity; but to baptize, it being a ſealing of a ſpecial priviledge to others, muſt come from an office-power, and ſo cannot ordinarily be adminiſtred by a gifted Diſciple.

Thirdly, there would be no diſtinction as to power, between Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Teachers in adminiſtration of any Ordinance, and every brother of the Church, if their rule ſtand; this is the common confuſion of the moſt of the contrary judgment, which utterly overthrows the other of Goſpel-Churches.

CHAP. XIX.

On Christs being baptized by John, *when he was about the thirtieth year of his age; whether any thing can be gathered from it against baptizing of Infants.*

THis is the last plea urged from Christs example, that he was not baptized untill about the thirtieth year, therefore none but grown persons ought to be baptized, if there be any force in Christs example.

To which is answered, 1. In general, actings are not always to be our examples; for some act he did meerly as Mediator, God-man, unimitable by us, as to be crucified for our sins; some he did out of special reason, and eminent emergency, as to fast forty dayes and nights in the wilderness, with many such like, up and down the Scripture, that are no rules to us; his personal and representative acts, and these which have been acted upon extraordinary occasion and reason, cannot be drawn into practical rule of example to us.

2. If we will take Christs example for a rule in this, that he was baptized when so grown up, why then we may as well take Christs practice, as our example; in the active sense, *he baptized none*, therefore none are to baptize; the same holds as strong as the other; if any say the rule afterward warrants that,

so

ſo it doth the baptizing of Infants, as hath been formerly proved.

3. And more home, Chriſt was a Saint in the womb, he profeſſed his faith from a childe, diſputed with the Doctors about Divine things when he was but 12. years old, ſo that he could be baptized with an infallible evidence at firſt, and yet was not baptized untill ſuch an age; hence if we will follow Chriſts example though men be known to be profeſſors, and never ſo godly, yet they muſt not be baptized untill juſt they come to the ſame ſtature, and term of years that Chriſt was baptized in; the reaſon is ſtronger for the one than the other, becauſe Chriſt, though he had ſuch a viſible, ſuch an infallible right to it, yet did abſtain from the practice of it, untill juſt ſuch a time, which he choſe out as fitteſt; ſo that the time hath as much force to make an example, and bindes as ſtrictly to the obſervance of it, as the general conſideration of him, as a grown perſon: upon this account no man muſt be baptized untill he be 29. or full 30. years of age.

4. There may be many conſiderations why Chriſt was baptized at years.

1. That he might enter on his publick miniſtry with the more greater ſolemnity of ſuch an Ordinance, and have a teſtimony from heaven to him in that Ordinance, which was given, *The Holy Ghoſt deſcending on him in the form of a* Dove, *Mat.* 3. two laſt *v.* Now Chriſts entrance into his publick miniſtry, began immediately after his baptiſm, how he converſt

vert for the moſt part of the former years, is very dark in Scripture.

2. It might be alſo, becauſe he would give a teſtimony to *John Baptiſt*, who, though he was deſigned from the womb to that work, yet began to act his office but a little while before, and had ſoon done. It's a queſtion whether he baptized any conſiderable time after he baptized Chriſt; but juſt as Chriſt did ariſe in his miniſtry, *John* fell in his.

3. As there is no reaſon to be given why Chriſt ſhould live ſo long, and not take on him his publick miniſtry, untill ſuch an age, nor may it be urged as ſuch an example to us; ſo there is no reaſon peremtorily to be given why he was not baptized untill then, and ſo the rule is uncertain, and of no value. But this example is contrary to the following rule left for baptizing, according to their own principles; For,

1. That Ordinance was immediately adminiſtred (as they) after believing, and profeſſion; Chriſt was a known Believer, and Profeſſor before; neither did he make a new profeſſion to *John* when he came to be baptized; but *John* rather ſcrupled it as an act too high for him to perform, as to ſuch a glorious perſon, *Mat* 3. *ſuffer it to be done* (ſaith Chriſt) &c. It would be a ſin for us to delay ſo long

2. Chriſts baptiſm was upon no other grounds than ours, his to fulfill all righteouſneſs in our ſtead, or to waſh away unrighteouſneſs, the filth of the fleſh, and ſpirit, as an outward ſign of it, and ſo can-

cannot come under the common rule; this I conceive ſufficient to be ſpoken as to that conſideration; *there onely remains*, that queſtion which will eaſily be anſwered on the former grounds, if they prove true, as they are demonſtrated, *The Lord give a bleſſing to theſe conſiderations on your heart.*

CHAP. XX.

That Baptiſm doth not form a Church.

SO much do our oppoſites advance Baptiſm, that they make it the onely conſtitutive principle of a Goſpel Church, by which men enter into the Church, and are made viſible Members onely by its adminiſtration, and in their own method. But we ſhall ſoon dethrone that poſition by the authority and force of Scripture and rational argumentation.

Onely in general, I doubt our Divines have unwittingly given them too much ground to affirm as they do, calling it an entrance into the Church, an initiating Ordinance, ſeal, and by their practice of late to ſet the Font nigh the Church-porch; though I would not much ſtand upon it how proper it is to call it an initiating Ordinance: (a phraſe I have uſed in this diſcourſe *Pro forma*) without it be becauſe it is the firſt ſeal to be adminiſtred in the Order of Sacraments; but it will be eaſily proved that Baptiſm gives no eſſence or being either to a Church, or membership.

1. Be-

1. Becauſe a man muſt be a member, and of a Church, ere he can be Baptized according to the Goſpel rule.

2. Sacraments are Ordinances to be adminiſtred in the Church, and to the Church, which ſuppoſeth the exiſtence of the Church before; thus 1*Cor.* 12.28. *Epheſ.* 4. 11,12,13. the Lord hath ſet in, and given all officers to the Church, if ſo, Sacraments, which muſt be adminiſtred by officers, if rightly.

3. A Church may be without Baptiſm, and yet be as true and as real a Church; as the *Iſraelites* were ſo long in the wilderneſſe without Circumciſion, which was as much an initiating Ordinance, as ever Baptiſm was; now nothing can be without its form, and exiſt.

4. That cannot be the form of a Church or make a man a Member, which remains the ſame, and untouched after excomunication, whereby a man is cut off from membership at preſent, but now though the Church may take away his membership, they cannot his Baptiſm, which is the ſame ſtill, and is not loſt.

5. For this is an abſolute rule, that that which gives the form, or being to a Church, it muſt ceaſe when the Church ceaſeth or when a Member ceaſeth to be a Member, it muſt ceaſe with it; and that muſt be renewed, as often as membership is renewed, and ſo one muſt be Baptized again, as often as he renews Membership; this is moſt abſurd, yet muſt follow from ſuch a principle.

6. Ba-

6. Baptiſm is a ſign, and ſeal, therefore gives no being to any thing, but confirms it; It is a conſequent act, and ſuppoſeth ſomething preexiſtent.

Obj. As for that place they ſo much ſtand on, *Act.* 2.41. *As many as received the word gladly, were Baptized, and there was added that day about three thouſand ſouls*; hence they ſay they were added by Baptiſm.

Sol. The words ſay not, they were added by Baptiſm, but puts a full point, or ſtop after that ſentence, *as many as gladly received the word, were Baptized.* There that ſentence ends. And the apoſtle goes on a new account; and ſaith, *there were added that day* 3000. *ſouls*, but doth not at al ſhew the manner of their adding; ſo that theſe words are rather a recapitulation, and ſumming up the number of Church Members added that day, than any deſcription of the way of their taking into the Church: as if one ſhould ſay, he had 3000l. in gold added to his eſtate, he only ſhews it is ſo, but not how he came to have that added, ſo it muſt be here; and the former reaſons prove the impoſſibility of ſuch an interpretation.

2. *Obj.* There is one place more urged to prove Baptiſm to be the form of a Church, and that which makes a Member, which is, 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *We are all Baptized into one body*, there Baptiſm onely embodies members.

Sol. To which I anſwer firſt, The Apoſtle ſpeaks there primarly of this baptiſm of the Spirit, not of

of water; So by one Spirit, we are Baptized into one Body, not ſo much of Baptiſm by water

But ſecondly, grant it to be meant of Baptiſm by water, yet it proves nothing that Baptiſm is the form of that body, which hath its matter and form, holineſs, and union before baptiſm; baptized into one body, doth not here ſhew the eſſential conſtitution of a Church, but the confirmed union.

For firſt, we are ſaid in *Gal.* 3 27. *to be baptized into Chriſt*; now none will conjecture that baptiſm gives the form of union with Chriſt, but onely ſeals it; ſo into one body, may be as to the unity of communion in the ſame body.

2. The phraſe of baptizing into, or in one body, ſhews the body exiſtent, and in perfect being before, elſe we could not be baptized in a body, or into a body; for when one is baptized firſt, into what body is he, and the ſecond, and third incorporated? untill a body be compleat, they cannot be ſaid to be baptized into it, or in it; therefore baptiſm cannot conſtitute the form of a Church, which is this body, ſaying, we are baptized into it, that is, to hold union and communion with ſuch a body.

3. This argument is inſerted more to prevent Schiſm, than to expreſs the way of firſt embodying or conſtitution of Churches, as the whole context demonſtrates.

4. It is the ſame reaſon with the *Lords* Supper, and we may as well be ſaid as to the firſt conſtitution, to conſtitute Churches by that Sacrament, as by baptiſm,

baptiſm, 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *The cup of bleſſing we bleſſe, is it not the communion of the bloud of Chriſt? the bread that we break, is it not the communion of the body of Chriſt? for we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.* So that we may as well be ſaid to be gathered into a Church by the Lords Supper, as by Baptiſm, for by it we are made one body, and one ſpirit.

But laſtly, if Baptiſm doth eſſentially conſtitute a Church, and is its form, then all who are Baptized are real Members of the Church, and muſt have all priviledges, be they never ſo looſe and vain; for they have the eſſential qualification, and the perfect form, and what will any deſire more? and ſtrange conſequences muſt needs follow: you may make whom you will Members, and make them Members before they are Members, and Baptize into a body before there is a body, or any knowledge of what frame the body is; you may Baptize and have no Church, for they may never come into Union, and Communion, who are baptized upon theſe terms, and then no Church can be conſtituted; for who ſhall baptize firſt? for he muſt have an extraordinary Commiſſion, for he can have no ordinary delegation, until the form be introduced which makes the Church, and that form is not, untill a competent number be baptized, and ſo Church-power muſt be exerciſed firſt without a Church, and political power without a body

It is wonderful to imagine how theſe that differ, ſlight

ſlight and unchurch all the Congregations, though made up of the pureſt, and ſpecialleſt Saints without mixture of humane allay, and meerly in this principle they are not baptized in their form, nor plunged under water, which with them is onely baptizing; and under this principle, Faith and repentance, and the moſt reſplendent graces of the beſt Saints muſt lye buried, and no Church, if not thus dipt: I hope you ſee the fallacy, if not the perfect folly of this poſition, and how Churches ſtand upon other principles more firm, and ſure; though we would not loſe any ornament of the Goſpel to adorn this body, yet we dare not conſtitute it of ſuch ingredients.

A GOSPEL

A GOSPEL-ORDINANCE

CONCERNING

The singing of Scripture-Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs; the lawfulness of that Ordinance.

LONDON,
Printed for *R.W.* and are to be sold at the three *Daggers* in *Fleetstreet*. 1657.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the ſinging of Scripture-Pſalms, Hymns and ſpiritual Songs; the lawfulneſs of that Ordinance.

THe next publick controverſie which Satan hath raiſed to diſturb the Churches, is about the practiſe of ſinging Scripture-Pſalms, on purpoſe to deprive the Saints of the benefit of that ſoul-raiſing, & heart-raviſhing Ordinance, by which God is publickly and ſolemnly praiſed, & the ſpirit filled with the glory of God; & becauſe your hearts may be ſtabliſhed in every truth, & not ſo eaſily perſwaded to part with ſuch a holy Ordinance, I could not but endeavor to clear up this alſo, which you have in this method.

Firſt that ſinging of Pſalms, Hymns, and ſpiritual, Songs, vocally with the voice, and muſically, is an Ordinance of the New Teſtament, conſtantly to be practiſed in the Churches of Chriſt.

Secondly, Open unto you the three expreſſions, Pſalms, Hymns, and Songs, wherein they agree, and whether there be any difference between them.

Thirdly, ſhew you that it is the Pſalms of *David*, *Aſaph*, *Heman*, and the Hymns and ſpiritual Songs of theſe holy men, which are recorded in Scripture, that is the matter ordinarily to be ſung.

Fourthly, anſwer the main objections of the diſſenters; theſe are ſcattered up and down this ſmall Treatiſe.

For the firſt, it is clear from *Eph.* 5. 19. he bids them be filled with the Spirit, λαλοῦντες, ſpeaking to one another, and in *Col.* 3. 16 *Teaching and admoniſhing one another* διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς πνευματικαῖς. What ever theſe be as to the matter of them, *i.* e. the ſinging of them is commanded as an Ordinance, and a ſpecial Ordinance for edification; That the Apoſtle exhorts here to this as an Ordinance, is clear;

Firſt, becauſe he ſpeaks to the whole Church, and as a publick duty, not appropriated to any Office, but as a commandment univerſally on all.

Secondly, he doth diſtinguiſh this Ordinance from that of preaching or teaching doctrinally, which belongs to the Officer, or occaſionally to a gifted brother; for he doth not only ſay, as in other places, teach and admoniſh; but in Pſalms and Hymns, and Songs, which ſhews the manner of the teaching and admoniſhing, not in the general, but in ſuch a way as by ſinging with Pſalms, &c. and as Mr. *Cotton* well obſerves,

obſerves, if the Apoſtle had meant the ordinary and common way of teaching, he would have ſaid, teach one another out of the Pſalms, or from them, rather than in, or with them, which is the uſual language of the holy Ghoſt in expreſſing ſuch a duty; ſo in Paul's example, *Acts* 28. 23 & to *Philip* is ſaid to preach Jeſus to the Eunuch (ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης) from that Scripture in Iſaiah: and ſurely he would never have added the word (ᾄδοντες) in the following part, ſinging with melody in your hearts, if this teaching & admoniſhing were not to be diſcovered in ſuch a peculiar Ordinance. To which places we muſt add that of the 1 *Cor.* 14, 15, 16. where the Apoſtle ſpeaks to the Church, as to the orderly adminiſtration of that Ordinance, 16, 17, v. where he ſpeaks of ſinging as a diſtinct duty, and to be done in publick before the Church; and that phraſe of ſinging with the ſpirit, and with underſtanding, is very emphatical, as Divines obſerve; for I cannot ſing with the ſpirit, but I muſt alſo with underſtanding; but the underſtanding here, muſt be meant of others who hear me, and joyn with me in that act; however, publick ſinging was then an Ordinance ſolemnized in the Church; and we ſhall hereafter ſee what kind theſe Pſalms were they ſung: Thus *James* 5. 13. *If any be merry, let him ſing Pſalms*; though this be particular in the Text, yet it is of the ſame conſideration with the former; and theſe places hold forth the inſtitution; ſinging is an Ordinance, and a ſpecial one in the Goſpel.

Secondly, that it is not only meant of an inward frame of rejoycing; but that it is of the voice; is moſt apparent.

1. From the very words of theſe Texts; *Speaking to one another, teaching one another, in Pſalms, and Hymns*, &c. Now no man can ſpeak to edifie others by inward workings, or ſilent rejoycings.

2. Beſides the melody, to be made in our hearts, we muſt ſing with melody which ſhews not only the inward frame, but the outward act, & order; for melody in the heart were enough to expreſs the inward grace; but he adds an outward expreſſion, *Singing with melody in your hearts*; ſo that it is with the voice as with the heart.

3. Singing in Scripture is ever put in diſtinction from bare reading or ſpeaking; and commonly ſignifies a modulation of the tongue, or expreſſing any thing muſically and in tune, and ſo it is a muſical ſpeaking.

4 There would be the greateſt confuſion of Ordinances; for preaching & prayer would be made all one with ſinging; nay, internal works would be found contrary to outward expreſſions; & if there be any ſuch things as preaching; & prayer & exhortation, it muſt be different from ſinging, even to the moſt ignorant; for no man will ſay, when a man meerly ſpeaks or preaches, he ſings, without his tone do make them call him a ſinging preacher or talker, as too many either out of affectation or cuſtome, have given juſt cauſe to ſuſpect.

5. This

5. This is undeniable, if there be any ſuch command as to ſing, it is viſible; for elſe no man could at any time be ſaid to ſing or not ſing; it muſt be an outward act; for elſe we muſt ſay we have only ſouls for that Ordinance, and bodies for all the reſt.

6. All that ever ſung in the Goſpel, as to practice, ſung vocally, *Mat.* 26.30. *They went out and ſung an Hymn*; that muſt be with an audible voice, *Act.* 16.25 *Paul* and *Silas* ſung, and all heard them; and if it be an inward act only, who ſhall know when men ſing or think; or would they have men to be gods, to judge when men ſing Pſalmes, and Hymns, and ſpiritual ſongs inwardly? what need theſe names outwardly? A more ungrounded opinion was never invented by the devil, and ſurely he hath fitted it for the weaker and moſt perfectly captivated ſorts of proſelytes, who have firſt loſt their reaſons, and then their conſciences.

Can my inward joy teach another? or my private ejaculations admoniſh another? I wiſh Satan have not theſe men at his will: they would have ſinging to be an Ordinance, but no man to hear them; So that if ſinging be not a diſtinct viſible Ordinance, then no man can tell what it is to ſing at all, but the ſame with preaching, praying, talking, or only an inviſible motion of the ſoul, known to God only; which is moſt abſurd, when we look on the weight of theſe places of Scripture mentioned formerly.

Ob. If any object, If ſinging be with the voice, why not with other inſtruments, as Lute, and Harp, and Organs, &c. as in the Old Teſtament. *Sol.*

Sol. First, in the New Testament the voice and heart are onely Gods instruments; this holds forth the special way of worship from soul and body, as from one person: artificial instruments are laid aside not natural ones.

Secondly, the voice is still required, because it is the most immediate Interpreter of the heart, and no outward instrument besides is so.

Thirdly, nothing can be expresst so significantly in outward characters, as by the voice; and the best expressions of God we have in words, and the tongue can best make out them.

Fourthly, the union of heart, and tongue, or voice, makes up the compleat expression of Gods praises, without any other consideration; for we have not now any thing as typical to look at; as Lute, and Harpe, &c. were in the Old Testament to praises, so ceremonies were to Christs sacrifice; when the substance came, they ceased; there is no need of them now, the spirit being more abundantly poured forth, and they have no significancy; but there needs soul and body always to sing out Divine stories, while in this world.

Fifthly, this hath been propheſied of, and long before the New Testament dayes, by the Prophets, of singing to God with a lively voice, when the voice shall be as Lute & Harpe, and all instruments to God, as in *Esa.* 52. 8. (as Mr. *Cotton* in that precious Treatise of his, worthy all mens consideration) compared with *Rom.* 10. 14. *Psal.* 100. 1. *Psal.* 95. 1, 2. all places referring prophetically to the gospel. Sixthly

Sixthly, if they dare grant this, that there must be no singing by voice, then they cut off themselves from any sort of singing by gift, in Psalms, or Hymns, & Spiritual Songs, & any outward way of expressing Gods praises; and must blot out singing in any way publickly as to be looked after, though a person never so much inspired by the holy Ghost (after their own sense) should extemporarily compose, & breath forth the most glorious Sonnets, or heavenly *Anthems*; for what is not a duty in it self, and general in the nature of it, is not a duty to the most raised spirit, if never so well gifted in such a mysterie.

But the wiser sort of the contrary judgement, who consult with Scriptures & the nature of things, will not own the dissent of others as to this, but confess singing of Psalmes must be by voice, & lay it on another foundation; that it is Psalms, &c. but not these we sing, that the command speaks of, but psalms of another constitution, from a peculiar gift, and so to be looked on by the Church, *viz.* not to sing *Davids* Psalms, or *Asaphs*, or the like; but from the fillings of the Spirit in such a person, & on a sudden break ing forth for the edification of the Church

I end this with what *Zanchy* saith of these places; These words ἐν χάριτι, and ἐν τῇ καρδία ὑμῶν singing with grace in your hearts, *non excludunt vocem oris, verum excludunt hypocrisin & vanitatem; ex qua ferè loquuntur ebrii vino* (& ἐν κάρδια *valet atque* ἐκ τῆς καρδίας) they do not exclude the voice, but hypocrisie, & vanity, from which men drunk with wine do sing;

ſing; and in your hearts, is as much as from your hearts, that is, not vainly, or as hypocritically, but as from inward ſenſe: So the Greek Scholiaſts, Μὴ τοῖς χείλεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ.

CHAP. II.

What's meant by theſe three expreſſions, Pſalms, Hymns, Spiritual-Songs; *how they are uſed in the Old Teſtament and the New Teſtament; from which the matter of* ſinging *is cleared.*

THe next difference is about the matter of ſinging, which all muſt grant to be Pſalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual-Songs: but what theſe Pſalms were, &c. and how to diſtinguiſh them one from another, muſt be debated ere we can clear the point between theſe three expreſſions; ſome conſtitute one difference, ſome another.

Ψάλμοι *Pſalms*, ſay ſome, are ſuch ſongs which were ſung with other Inſtruments beſides the tongue.

Zanchius.

Ὕμνοι, *Hymns*, ſuch as are made only to expreſs the praiſes, and ſet out the excellencies of God. Ὠδαὶ, *Songs*, ſuch as contain not only praiſes, but exhortations, propheſies, thankſgiving; and theſe only ſung with the voice and tongue

Others

Others difference them thus: *Pſalmes* are thoſe which were penn'd by *David* and others, drawn up into meeter to be ſung in the Temple in a muſical ſtrain. *Hymns* are thoſe extemporal praiſes which break forth upon occaſion from a heart filled with the Spirit, and obſervant of Gods goodneſs. *Songs* or *Odes* they call ſuch that were premeditated not without ſome art: Theſe they call the *S*ongs of *Moſes*, *Deborah*, *Hannah*, *Simeon*, *Mary*, *&c.*

Grotius.

But we ſhall find, if we conſult the uſe of the words, the difference will not be conſiderable between them, and that they are uſed promiſcuouſly in the Old Teſtament, from whence we muſt learn how they are to be taken in the New: Now,

1. I finde they are uſed in general as the title of *Davids* P*ſalms*, which are named promiſcuouſly by theſe three words.

2. That the three Hebrew words, *viz.* מזמר *Mizmor*, שיר *Schir*. תהלם *Tehillim*, to which theſe three, Ψάλμος, Ὕμνος Ὠδή. do fully anſwer, are uſed in the pſalms one for another, without diſtinction; and ſometimes two of them joyned together as the title of one pſalm; ſometimes all three joyned together in one title; we could heap up examples in this kind. *Judges* 5 3 ſaith *Debroah*, אשירה אומר, *I will ſing, I will ſing unto the Lord* it's tranſlated by the 70; ἄσωμαι καὶ ψαλῶ here is two words; the one uſed for a Pſalm, the other for an

an Ode or Song put to expreſs one בשיר 1 *Chron.* 16. 9. the two ſame words are tranſlated thus in the 70. ᾄσατε αὐτῷ ψάλατε. *Sing unto the Lord, ſing an Hymn unto the Lord.* In *Pſal.* 105 3. which is the ſame Pſalm, onely inſerted into the body of the Book of the Pſalms; the former word שירו, is rendred by ᾄσατε, *ſing* Pſalms: and thus the ſame words in the ſame verſe is expreſt by theſe two words, yet hold forth one thing. In *Eſay* 12. 5. זמרו is rendred ὑμνήσατε. In the title of *Pſal.* 38. 1. *Miqmer* is rendred by ᾠδὴν which is here tranſlated *a Song:* and in moſt of the titles one is uſed for another without diſtinction: and שיר *Schir*, which is moſt uſually rendred by ᾠδὴν *a Song*, yet is alſo rendred by ψαλμὸς *a Pſalm. Pſal.* 45 1. and 47. 1. And by ὕμνος, *a Hymn, Eſay* 42. 10. As for the other word תהלים *Tehilim*, that comprehends fully both Hymns and Songs; it is the general title of the Book of Pſalms, where the variety of them are contained. And as ſome particular Pſalms are called in the Greek Hymns or Odes according to the two former words: ſo this word is put at top, holding forth the ſignificancy of all the reſt, and diſtinguiſhing the Pſalms from all other Books of Scripture, as theſe that know the ſuperſcription of that Book underſtand: and it ſignifies the moſt univerſal and full way of praiſing God, eſpecially by ſinging; and it's expreſt by various words, as (αἰνεῖν, ἐπαινεῖν) *to praiſe*; (ἐγκωμιάζειν) *to commend or ſet forth the reputation of another*; (δοξάζειν) *to glorifie or diſcover the glory of another*: (εὐλογεῖν)

(εὐλογεῖν) *to blesse*, with many other expressions; So in particular (ψάλλειν) *Psal* 145. 1. but most especially in this last word (תהלה) which is a word for all psalms expresst by (ὕμνος) *a Hymn*; as 2 *Chron.* 7. 6. and 23. 13. *Psalm* 39. 4. 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. *Psal.* 21. 13. *Psal* 64. 1. and 99. 3. where the one word is translated by the other.

For their conjunction of each of them together in one a title of a psalm, is very usual & often inverted: The title of *Psal.* 29. 1. is in the Hebrew, מזמור שיר *Mizmor Schir*; in the Greek translation its ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς, *a Psalm of a Song*, or *a Song and a Psalm*. So 64. 1. and 47. 1. and 86. 1. but in 65. 1. there the title is שיר מזמור and translated ᾠδὴ ψαλμοῦ, *a Song of a Psalm*, or *a Song and Psalm*. So *Psal.* 82. 1. But unto the title of *Psal.* 75. the 70 Greek Interpreters (from whom these words are borrowed in the *New* Testament) do adde all the three together; Εἰς τὸ τέλος, ὑπὲρ ὑμνῶν, ψαλμὸς τῷ Ἀσάφ, ᾠδὴ πρὸς τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους; *A Psalm to Asaph in or with Hymns*; *a Song to the Assyrians*. By all which we see, and might by many more,

1. That there is not such a criticall distinction to be made between a spiritual Psalm, and a Hymn, and Song, but that they are put indifferently one for another.

2. Having opened the words with their use (I hope with advantage to those that know the language of the Hebrew with the Septuagint) let us now consider them as the matter to be sung, and what these

Psalms,

Pſalms, Hymns and Spiritual *S*ongs are; whether *Davids*, *Aſaphs*, *Hemans*, and ſuch other which are found in Scripture pen'd by holy men upon ſpecial occaſions, or another of a new compoſure; the former of which I affirm to be an Ordinance of the New Teſtament.

1. Theſe are the titles given ſolely to *Davids* P*ſalm*., and the other Scripture-*S*ongs, which theſe holy men, Divinely inſpired, breathed forth, & left on record: And as Mr. *Cotton* excellently argues, What reaſon can there be why the Apoſtle ſhould direct us in our ſinging to the very title of *Davids* P*ſalms*, and other Scripture Songs, if he meant we ſhould not ſing theſe Pſalms and Songs? Either we muſt exclude D*avids* P*ſalms* and the reſt from being called Pſalms, or Hymns, or Spiritual-Songs, or elſe they muſt be ſung as well as others.

2. The names are borrowed from the Greek Tranſlators of the Old Teſtament, and there is no diſtinction of them in the New; neither can any one tell what they mean, but as by their uſe in the Old Teſtament: Now theſe names were uſed there as peculiar characters to expreſs and diſtinguiſh the works of *David*, & the reſt, which were penned to be ſung in the Church: Let theſe which are againſt ſinging *Davids* P*ſalms*, & of other holy men, ſhew us any one word or ſylable in the New Teſtament, where any of theſe words are taken in any other ſenſe than as they were in the Old, & yet we are commanded to ſing them in the New; on this ground the caſe would

be

be ſoon concluded; when the queſtion is propounded, (granting this is a command for ſinging) what ſhall we ſing? why, Pſalms, Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs; how ſhall we know what theſe are? we muſt look in Scripture, where theſe words are uſed; now we find them here explained ſo properly as in the Old Teſtament; where they are the uſual titles of *Davids* Pſalms, and the ſongs of other Holy men, and no other uſe of them expreſt in the New; why may not we judge then, theſe are the Pſalms, and Hymns, & ſpiritual Songs we are there commanded for to ſing? But,

3. Come to the New Teſtament, and there whenever Chriſt or his Apoſtles ſpeak of Pſalms, they refer us to Scripture-Pſalms, *Luke* 20. 42. (Chriſt ſaith) As it is written in the Book of the Pſalms, that is the 110. Pſal. *The Lord ſaid unto my Lord, ſit thou at my right hand:* in *Luke* 24. 44. when Chriſt would make an exact diviſion of the Old Teſtament, he divides them into the Law of *Moſes*, the Prophets, and the Pſalms, diſtinguiſhing the *Pſalms* from all other Scripture, as a peculiar book by it ſelf; And as when we are commanded to read the Law, and the Prophets, we cannot think them to be any other than the writings of *Moſes* and *Samuel*, and the reſt of the Prophets in the Old Teſtament; So when we are commanded to ſing Pſalms, not the Law or the Prophets, how can we imagine it unlawful to ſing that part of Scripture which is properly called the *Pſalms*, as the writing of *David*, *Aſaph*, &c? So the Apoſtle,

Act.

Acts 1.20. ſpeaking of *Judas* his fall, and ruin, ſaith, as it was written of him in the Book of the P*ſalms*, *Let his habitation be made deſolate*, &c. P*ſa.* 69.26. and in the 16. *verſe* (ſaith *Peter*) the holy Ghoſt by the *mouth of David* ſpake this concerning *Judas*, & v. 20. for it is written in the book of the P*ſalms*. *Acts* 2. *Acts* 25. and 29. inſtead of ſaying as in the P*ſalms*, he ſaith, *David* ſpeaketh of Chriſt thus and thus in P*ſal.* 16. *Acts* 13.33. ſpeaking of Chriſt again; he ſaith, *As it is written in the ſecond* P*ſalm*, and v.35. *As it is written in another* P*ſalm*, which is the 16. By all which is clear what Chriſt and the Apoſtles would have us to underſtand by P*ſalms* (when we are commanded to ſing them (eſpecially theſe P*ſalms*, which are called the Book of the P*ſalms*; and there is no other P*ſalms* ſpoken of in the New Teſtament; and the holy Ghoſt is the beſt Expoſitor of his own commands. Now men muſt either deny theſe of *Davids*, (as before) to be P*ſalms*, or elſe they are bound to ſing them as for Hymns and Songs: they are comprehended under this general word (P*ſalms*) being all expreſt in the Book of the P*ſalms*, as hath been demonſtrated.

4. Let us conſider the vanity of the former opinion, in regard it utterly makes way for will-worſhip, which they ſeem to be ſo much againſt. For firſt, I am commanded to ſing Pſalms, Hymns, Songs: the Old and New Teſtament ſpeak of no other Pſalms than of *Davids* and *Aſaphs*, & of ſuch like inſpired perſons; and they are called the Pſalms of Chriſt and his Apoſtles

Apoſtles, but you muſt not ſing them (ſay they) I ask what Pſalms then muſt you ſing? there is no light in Old or New Teſtament to warant any other; either you muſt fancy a Pſalm, and ſay Chriſt meant this way, when he ſpake of the Book of the Pſalms, and deviſe a new way of worſhip out of your own brains, or elſe ſing theſe Pſalms, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles call Pſalms. Beſides, 2. How can any man perſwade himſelfe, or others, when he ſings, that he ſings a Pſalm, when he doth not ſing that which in Scripture is onely called a Pſalm? Or how can any man diſtinguiſh, now I ſing a Pſalm, now a Hymn, now a Song, when there is not one word in the New Teſtament to diſtinguiſh them one from another, or the two latter from the Book of the Pſalms? if any man from the New Teſtament can diſtinguiſh a Pſalm from a Hymn, or a Hymn from an Ode or Song, or any one from another, but as they borrow it from the Old Teſtament, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*; he ſhall be an Oracle I will conſult more than with Scripture. They tell us *Davids* Pſalms, and the like are not to be ſung: Chriſt and his Apoſtles call them ſpecially by the name of Pſalms, and command us to ſing Pſalms. Now let them ſhew us any other Pſalms from Scripture, and we are ſatisfied; but it's hard to be perſwaded from ſuch a pretious Ordinance, by a meer Negative, and the workings of a melancholy fancy, or the preſumption of a hot brain that he hath a gift of compoſing Pſalms, and Songs, and Hymns, for the edification of the Church.

Let us go on further, and try the Scripture examples; and begin with our Lord Jesus Christ and his Disciples, after the administration of his Supper; its said in *Mat.* 26. 30. and *Mark* 14. 26, *when they had sung an hymn*, (or a *Psalm* as the margent expresseth it,) and its all one, *they went forth to the mount Olivet*, the words are, ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος &c. Take it either as all Translators interpret, having sung an *Hymn*, Hymn *dicto Arab*: *They went forth*, or *they went forth Hymning*, (or singing of a *Psalm*,) its not material: But 1. Its clear they sung openly with their voice. 2. They sung a *Psalm* or *Hymn*; now what this *Hymn* should be, is the question, whether one of *Davids Psalms*, or any in that Book; to which I answer: 1. Its onely said they sung an *Hymn* or *Psalm*, and its most probable, yea demonstrative, that it was one of these *Psalms*, or *Hymns* of *David* and the other Holy men, because Christ himself speaks of no other, as before: 2. Because Christ was so much propheſied of in these *Psalms*, which were formerly sung prophetically, & with thanksgiving for these very acts before-hand. 3. Because Christ did still quote the same *Psalms*, to prove both his Divinity and sufferings; so did his Apostles. Now it was no more dishonour, or unsuitable to Christ to sing with his Disciples one or more of these *Hymns* or *Psalms*, than it was to prove himself, and his mediatorship by them, which he doth in all the former places, yea the very nature and manner of his sufferings. 4. We have

Scripture

Scripture ground from Christs expression to believe the one, and only our own conjectures that he sung any other P*salms*, or *Hymns*; and that Christ both before and after his death should bring his choice proofs of his person, & humiliation, and glory from the book of the P*salms*, and when he was to suffer it should be found they sung a P*salm*, or *Hymn* and yet not one of these P*salms*, is very hard to press on a Scripture conscience, especially when the act expresst is in general, & the same word used for singing such P*salms*, and no other determination of it in the New Testament: let them but weigh things in an equal ballance of the Sanctuary & judge; yea, let them who are so high on the other side, shew us from Scripture what that *Hymn*, or P*salm* was, which Christ & his disciples sung after the Supper, and give us any place as a comment on it, & but the hint to our demonstration, & we shall think our selves well quit of such a mistake: in the mean while the argument stands thus untouched, Christ and his Disciples sung an *Hymn*, and Christ and the Apostles speak of no other *Hymns*, or P*salms*, but these recorded in the Old Testament, especially these in the book of the P*salms*; therefore they sung none other. And surely Christ would conform his practise to his expressions, or would have made some distinction.

The second great example of singing is that of Paul and Silas, *Acts* 16. 25. where it is said, *They sung an Hymn to God, or gave praises in the prison at midnight*; we are still on the same account as formerly, and ask

what this *Hymn* was they ſung, if not one of theſe P*ſalms* of Scripture which they might have choſen for this preſent condition? If any one can ſay it was an extemporary ejaculation, Let them ſhew us their proof; we ſhew them the Scripture-uſe of the word, and which was known to them; and theſe that oppoſe muſt have ſomething from the reaſon of the Text, or uſe of the Word to contradict us, and confirm themſelves; they did not barely ſing, but ὑμνεῖν τὸν θεὸν They ſung *Hymns*; and do not we go on ſurer grounds that ſing theſe P*ſalms* and *Hymns*, which in the *New* Teſtament Chriſt and his Apoſtles do call ſo, than what we imagine to be P*ſalms*, and *Hymns*, &c, by an unſcriptural ſuppoſition? ſo that the ſumm of all may be drawn up thus to argue.

1. If it is our duty to obey Divine commands; It is a command to ſing P*ſalms*, *Hymns*, *ſpiritual Songs*; *ergo*, it is our dudy.

2. It is a command to ſing P*ſalms Hymns*, *ſpiritual Songs*, as to the matter; but there is no other P*ſalms*, *Hymns*, or *Spiritual ſongs* mentioned in the Old or New Teſtament, but theſe which are penn'd by Holy men, inſpired to that end; *ergo*, it is our duty to ſing them.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

An Answer to that Objection concerning singing by a gift, not set Psalms.

ONe special Objection that is made against singing Scripture-*Psalms*, &c. is that it hinders the exercise of gifts, and so its but formal; all duties in the Church must be done from a gift.

Answer. 1. You see here is a duty laid on us, no such limitation as from a gift.

2. The matter is prescribed you, *Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, and to these you are especially enjoyned: now the limitation of the matter limits the duty.

3. There is no promise of such a gift in the Gospel, to compose *Psalms*, and *Hymns*; God hath provided matter sufficient; there is a promise for the spirit of prayer and supplication, *Zach.* 12. and of preaching and propheſying, in *Joel*, repeated in *Acts* 2. but no distinct promise for a gift of spiritual Poetry, or Singing; for there are but three things required to singing, fit matter, a voice, and heart; all which may be performed without any such special gift of composing; the matter, is ready, if the heart and voice be present.

4. It is a duty laid generally on the whole Church without any distinction of gifts; all are commanded to sing, &c. Here is no hint of a gift required.

5. Chriſt would not ordain an Ordinance of ſuch conſequence, which the Churches ſhould want the uſe of; ſome utterly, and not one among many ſhould know what it means; for there is hardly one among a thouſand of Saints which hath ſuch a gift of compoſing *Pſalms* and *Hymns*, &c. and if it be an Ordinance in one Church, all others may want it, and ſo be deprived of the comfort of ſuch a ſweet Ordinance for want of a pretended gift, when they have matter enough of praiſes before them.

6. It is lawfull to make uſe of the gifts of others, as well as to uſe our own; when a man hath a gift of prayer, I joyn with him, and make uſe of his gifts, &c. So is it much more lawful to make uſe of the gifts of holy and bleſſed men in Scripture, who had that glorious gift of compoſing all ſorts of *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *ſpiritual Songs*, and when we ſing them with melody in our hearts, we manifeſt all thoſe treaſures of the gifts of the Spirit, that breathed in theſe *Pſalms*, &c. as if we had from a perſonal gift compoſed them our ſelves: for if we ſing them with the ſame underſtanding, with the ſame inward affection of love, joy &c. we ſing them with the ſame ſpirit.

7. If there were ſuch a gift promiſed, it would have been mentioned by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, as the gift of tongues and miracles were, and Saints would have been inſtructed to ſeek for it, and theſe that had it, would have been commanded to wait on it, as the Elders are on exhortation, teaching, ruling, the Deacons

Deacons on adminiſtring, and diſtributing, &c. *Rom.* 12.6,7,8,9,10.

8. It is Antichriſtian to introduce an Ordinance to be practiſed among the Churches, which hath not been commanded by Chriſt & his Apoſtles, (theſe that differ, make much uſe of the word *Antichriſtian*) and cannot but grant this principle to be undeniable; now I aſſume but to introduce; A way of ſinging by a gift with caſting off Scripture-*Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, was never commanded by Chriſt or his Apoſtles, *ergo*, it is Antichriſtian; the *minor* hath been proved before; there is no mention in the writings of Chriſt or the Apoſtles, of ſinging *Pſalms* by a perſonal gift, or of a gift of compoſing *Pſalms* either for our ſelves or the Church; neither is there mention of any other *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, as the matter to be ſung, but ſuch as are penn'd in Scripture, and left to be ſung by all the Churches. Thus if men will bring in a new Ordinance, they muſt ſhew their authority from the Word, or elſe apply the word *Antichriſtian* to themſelves.

For that expreſſion in 1 *Corinth.* 14. 26. *When you come together* (ἕκας ὑμῶν ψαλμὸν ἔχει) *every one hath a Pſalm, hath a Doctrine*, &c. from whence they gather they had a gift of compoſing *Pſalms* by the Spirit, which they were to ſing in the Church, if they did it orderly.

To which I further anſwer, there is not any thing to explain what *Pſalm* this was.

2. We have more reaſon to think it was one of theſe

Scripture-*Psalms*, which the New Testament always called a *Psalm* (as he saith, in the second *Psal.* and in another *Psalm* as before) far from reason then they have to say it was a *Psalm* of their own composing by a gift; every one hath a *Psalm*, that is, this & the other have a *Psalm*, that is one had this *Psalm* in Scripture which he thought most proper, another, another of these *Psalms*; for ἕκαστος is not to be taken universally of all, but singulary; one hath this, another that; thus some; but rather the meaning is, not as if one had this *Psalm*, and another another; but one hath a *Psalm*, another a *Doctrine*, another to speak with tongues, another to prophesie; now thus there was a confusion among them; one would have a *Psalm* sung, another would have his *Doctrine*, or *word of construction* as most fit, another his *Revelation*. Now the Apostle onely tells them they might all be dont one by one, and in order; he that had a *Psalm* to be sung, might in its proper place, but this doth not prove that it was a *Psalm* extemporarily composed, or by a personal gift, or that it was not one of the *Psalms* in that which the Scripture calls the Book of the *Psalms*.

Object. If any say further, It must needs be from a gift, because it is joyned with other acts which were meerely from a gift, as *Doctrine*, *Tongues*, *Revelations*, *Prophecy*, *Interpretation*.

I Answer, of these things here named, some are accounted extraordinary, and peculiar, as gifts of *Tongues*, *Revelations*, fitted for these times; the other ordina-

ordinary, as *Doctrine*, *Interpretation*, *Prophesie* (though some think this last extraordinary also) so having a *Psalm* may be accounted ordinary, and not from an extraordinary gift as the gift of tongues was; however you must not make a particular argument from things of divers considerations and uses.

2. Other Scriptures have determined what a *Psalm* is, and it may be easily gathered what it is in the *Corinthians* for one to have a *Psalm*: we prove they had a *Psalm*; let them prove what that *Psalm* was, besides these Scripture-*Psalms* onely mentioned in the New Testament.

It is most evident that the matter of singing is determined by the words of the Apostle, in *Colos.* 3. 16. *Let the word of God dwell richly in you*, &c. which in *Eph.* 5. is more in general, *Be filled with the Spirit*, which do not make any difference; for the Word and the Spirit must make up the melody in our hearts: but still the word of God is the matter to be sung with the Spirit, as it is the matter for reading, preaching, interpretation; but he here names that part of the word which belongs to the duty he enjoyns; as a special part of that word which ought to dwell richly in them, as to such a duty of singing: So that,

1. If *Psalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*, be part of the word of God, then they may be sung.

2. If that part of the Word be more properly fitted to the duty commanded than any other, it must be so restrained here.

3. That

3. That it is ſo, appears, becauſe he ſpeaks ſo particularly, *That the word might dwell in them richly, teaching and admoniſhing one another*, not in *general*, as by Preaching, Doctrine, or the like: but in *Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *ſpiritual Songs*, which muſt needs be the great duty in the Text, and all before reſtricted to that.

4. Then the word of God in general, or any ſpeciall Word of God may be ſaid to dwell richly in a perſon, when the ſpiritual intent, ſenſe, and meaning of it, with the inward ſpirit, and power of it upon all occaſions doth appear in the duties commanded by it; and thus you may ſee the verſe in its parts.

1. Here is the duty, ſinging.

2. The Word of God, the matter.

3. The ſpecialty of the VVord ſo fitted to the nature of that duty, *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *ſpiritual Songs*.

4. The peculiar way how to be a perfect ſpiritual Singer; it is to have this word *dwell* in a man, and richly, having the true ſenſe, ſweet experience of this word in the heart, being upon all occaſions able to cull out in the language of Scripture, *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, ſutable to our own conditions or others.

If the Apoſtle had meant here a gift of compoſing new *Pſalms*, &c, as he would not have uſed the Old Teſtament language without an explanation; ſo he would not have mentioned the word of God in ſuch a cloſe limitation as in *Pſalms*, and *Hymns*, and *Songs*,

Songs, which are exegetical to the word of *God* to be ſung, if he had not intended that part of the VVord as fitted for that Ordinance; for no man knows what theſe expreſſions hold forth, but as they are found in the word of *God*, and as a diſtinct and eminent part of it. It were more proper to ſay, *Let the grace of God dwell in you*, or *the goodneſſe of God*, that you may from the ſenſe of it break forth upon all occaſions to praiſes. But to name the VVord of *God*, and name it with that modification, as *Pſalms*, Hymns, Songs, which we all know is a part of it, and bid us ſing, and deny us in his intention for to ſing theſe *Pſalms* which are part of that VVord, is too unworthy a reflection on the Holy *Ghoſt*, and the Pen-men of Scripture. And that ſeems very ſtrange to affirm, that I may not ſing that VVord of *God* which is called by the name of *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, when this VVord muſt dwell in me richly to that end and uſe.

Laſtly, the ſinging of theſe *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, as the VVord of *God* is moſt adapt and proportioned to the particular uſe the Apoſtle intended by ſinging in the Church, which was to teach and admoniſh one another. Now no gift of any Saint can be ſo powerful, and authoritative to teach, as the Word of *God* in theſe *Pſalms*, which were penn'd by the ſpirit, as a rule to all Saints, and their gifts; and as the Word of God is made uſe of ſeveral ways to teach, and admoniſh, ſo this is one ſpecial way, by *Pſalms*, *Hymns*, *Songs*. When I ſing by a pretended

gift

gift, I ſee cauſe of jealouſie, that it may be more a fancy than the ſpirit; every man hath cauſe of ſuſpition from whence it comes, and ere I can be ſatisfied I muſt compare it with, and try it by the Scripture ſtrain of P*ſalms*, *Hymns* and *Songs*. But by ſinging the very words of *Scripture* with ſenſe, and experience, I teach both by my holy carriage in the action, and the word it ſelf commands by its own authority as when it is read.

But that I may more clearly open this, how that the Word of God in P*ſalms*, *Hymns*, and *Songs*, is the moſt fit matter of ſinging, let us view that part of the Word called by theſe names, and ſee how far it will reach this kind of edification, beyond all that which may come from a preſent gift to compoſe matter from ſuch a duty.

1. Beſides the ſpiritual elegancy of phraſe, the inſpired ſtyle of that part of holy writ, which is beyond ordinary with the height of matter, of no vulgar compoſure, it having ſuch a ſtanding ſtamp of Divine authority on it, muſt needs convey its ſenſe with more weight and power, than any thing from particular invention, though aſſiſted by a gift of the ſpirit, which comes but in the ſecond place; and cannot be put in any conſideration with that authority as the other, nor inſerted among the heavenly Canons and Scripture-rules for Saints to build their faith on, or direct their lives.

2. The largneſſe, and comprehenſiveneſſe of the ſcope of the ſhorteſt Pſalm, is ſo, that it will give matter

matter to ſtudy and ponder on, and give advantage to enlarge our thoughts and affections on more than any particular gift of any Saint now can be rationally conceived to afford; for commonly the beſt gifts are but an enlargement of the firſt text, and bring forth nothing *de novo*, no new thing, and all theſe Saints with all their gifts muſt be glad to have recourſe to that part of the Word, as the reſt, for the fullneſs of teaching and admonition.

3. The variety of matter in the P*ſalms*, &c. is ſo wonderfull, that they do provide before-hand by an eternall wiſdom, for the conditions of all Saints, either perſonally, or myſtically, that no man ſing any thing, but if that Word dwell in him richly, he may finde a ſutable P*ſalm* prepared for him, by the foreſight, and wiſe, and infallable directions of the Almighty; and in this, the Book of the Pſalms tranſcends all other parts of Scripture, and may be called the Epitome of the whole Bible. In ſome Scriptures you have little but matter of precept, in others litle but hiſtorical relations of perſons, and actions; but in the Book of the P*ſalms* you have the variety of matter conteined in all the whole Scripture, moſt ſuitable to the vaſt duty of ſinging praiſes.

1. Matter of all ſorts of propheſies referring to the very latter end of the world.

2. All ſorts of general and ſpecial directions, either for Faith or Life.

3. All ſorts of promiſes fitted to particular conditions.

4. All

4. All ſorts of experiences in what condition a ſoul may be in, either of tryal or triumph, either to ſoul or body.

5. All ſorts of ſigns and characters of heavenly motions and frames to *God*.

6. All ſort of thankſgivings and prayſes for ſpiritual or temporal mercies, with their various diſcords which makes up the harmony of the whole. He is a child in the Scripture, that doth not admire the unparallel'd variety of truth in that Book, ſo that if I were raiſed by ſome extraordinary gift to the greateſt inlargement of compoſing a P*ſalm*, or *ſpiritual Song* on a ſpeciall occaſion, I ſhould come ſhort of the variety, and fullneſs of the leaſt of theſe P*ſalms*, and yet the ignorant ſtanders by might more admire my gift, and there would be more danger in it, than to ſing the Scripture P*ſalms* which have nothing from men to grace them but their own native majeſty and authority. And truly, it is ſomewhat odd for one to be ſet up by others, or for any one to be ſet up himſelf as a ſpiritual Poet in the *Church*, and the *Church* to ſing his thoughts, with the neglect of the Word of *God*, which is furniſhed with ſuch variety for the conditions of ſouls.

And as the word of *God* in general is ſo large, and vaſt, and various, that all the Saints with their higheſt improvements can never come up to the fulneſs of it, and all the vaſt folio's that have been written by Commentators of all ſorts, have hardly peirced the bark, the ſhell, the letter, and all Saints of the higheſt

higheſt attainment, muſt dig in to it as the only viſible Mine, and we muſt not exclude the P*ſalms* as to ſinging from that fullneſs and variety, ſeeing Chriſt himſelf when he diſtinguiſheth the whole Scripture, gives the P*ſalms* an equal part.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Tranſlation of Davids Pſalms, *and other* ſpiritual Hymns, *and* Songs, *with the Anſwer to the Objection ariſing from it.*

I Have endeavoured to prove the duty; let us conſider the ſtrength of the main Objections againſt it.

Ob. The firſt in order is that which carps at the Tranſlation, & that into Meetre, as the humane invention; the Tranſlation (ſay they) is corrupt, and eſpecially as into Meetre, and Tune; if you will ſing *Davids* P*ſalms*, ſing them in Hebrew, as they were ſung formerly: thus they much ſtick on.

Sol. To which I anſwer, that in theſe Pſalms, and Songs, there was a ſet Meetre, fitted to Tunes, and Voices, & muſicall Inſtruments; none can deny that obſerves the Dedications of moſt Pſalms, and thoſe of underſtanding that can read learned *Gomarus* may ſee it fully, and with great exactneſs; where the ſpiritual poeſie of theſe Pſalms is excellently ſet forth.

2. So

2. So far as there is corruption in the Tranſlation it is ſpurious, and not to be approved of, but corrected.

3. But Tranſlations according to the import of the words and ſenſe of the Text, are as much the Word of God, as the Text in the original; for the coherence of word and ſenſe make up the copy entire and perfect.

4. Which follows, the Tranſlation of the words in Meetre, if it have the full ſenſe of the words, is as much the Word of God, as if it were tranſlated in proſe, or ordinary ſentence for reading; for it is not the way or method, but the ſenſe & meaning of the words, that is the *Word* of God. So that I may as well ſay when I ſing in ſuch a compoſition, it is as much the *Word of God* as when I read the ſame words in the Bible, only they are orderly diſpoſed for that action: None muſt by this reaſon, pretend to know the Word of God in reading or expounding, but he that knows the Hebrew, and Greek: and that muſt be alſo in the firſt perfect copy, immediately tranſcribed from inſpired underſtandings; for all things beſides are either tranſlations, or additions, or ſubſtractions, from which two laſt comes perfect corruption.

So that a tranſlation for ſinging, or reading, is the *ſame Word of God* as long as it hath the ſame ſubſtantial truth in it; and ſing them which way you will, either as they lie in the verſe, or as the ſame verſe is digeſted into ſtaves, and with muſical notes, it is all one as to the nature of ſinging, and the tranſlation

may

may be as Orthodox in Meetre, as in Prose; for that you see what force, efficacy, that objection from the translation carries with it; I confesse there are many defects in the translation into Meetre, but there are the like in som copies in prose, or continued sentence; but as to the nature of the thing, one verse may as well be made two, according to musical notation, and yet retain the same continued sense, as remain one, onely bounded by Arithmetical figures, as 1, 2, 3, &c.

Obj. But if any one say the Psalms as thus translated into Meetre, are but an humane invention, and you worship God onely after an humane form.

Sol. The Answer is at hand.

1. To know the significancies of the tongues, and how to translate them to edification, is a special gift of Gods spirit, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28, 29. 1 *Corinth.* 14. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

2. On this ground we read humane inventions when we read the Old or New Testament in any translation, but the first copies of Hebrew and Greek, wherein they were first written.

3. Is it not more a humane invention for to sing any thing of my own composing, then for to sing the very matter, and sense of the Word of God in my own tongue? and yet its usual among these that are against this Ordinance, to cry aloud, It is a humane invention, Antichristian.

4. The translation of the Scripture for to be read, is as much a humane invention, as in poesie to be sung; but this is an Objection urged for want of a better.

Obj. The next grand Objection is, that we may as well use a set form of Prayer, as of singing Psalms; the one is as lawfull as the other, the one stints the spirit as much as the other.

Sol. 1. There is no Divine holds that a set form of Prayer is absolutely unlawfull, for then no man may meditate before hand what he ought to pray for, nor consult with his own mouth, or Gods promises; for if I meditate on what I need, and what God hath promised, I form such petitions, and tie my self to them as necessary to be petitioned for, and it may be I may have no occasion for a long while to begg any thing of God, but the substance of these premeditated considerations of my want.

2. Here lies the unlawfulness of set form of prayer, that it is composed by one, and imposed by another, to which I am limited, let my wants be what they will, requiring further additions when I neither study my own wants, nor am permitted to urge them to God in my prayer.

3. This is a more sutable Objection aginst those that pretend to sing by a gift, and do make Psalms, or Hymns, or Songs, for themselves and others, with neglect of inspired Psalms, and Hymns. So singing of Psalms, and using a set form of Prayer, are very nigh of kin, and hold much correspondency.

4. But to sing the very words of these Scriptures with understanding, is a command, as hath been formerly proved; and if you take a set form of praying, for praying Scripture words, and speaking to God

God in that language, it is not only lawful, but is the excellency of ſome Saints, who ſeldom make a Petition, but they urge it in Scripture-dialect, and ſhew the Word of God to dwell richly in them; thus for ſinging to praiſe God, or ſing to God in his own form of words in the ſpirit, and underſtanding, what can be more ſutable to God, and ſweet to the ſoul?

5. There is a great deal of difference between praying and ſinging, as to the method of performance, though praying and praiſes may be conſidered in the ſame duty, *yet praying and ſinging* require a diſtinct method; for the very words, to ſing Pſalms, and Hymns, and Songs, import a ſpecial method of the voice in a ſet tune, and proportion, whereas prayer in the method of performance requires no ſuch exactneſs; if one ſhould take on him to ſing and not in a ſet form, and tune, he would be ridiculous to all hearers: but a man hath a larger liberty in prayer, and is not tyed to ſuch ſtrait connexions, heights, and falls, ſtops, and pauſes; but the nature of this Ordinance calls for it, elſe it cannot be done gracefully, though there be grace in the heart. And if the Apoſtle had not meant by ſinging of Pſalms, ſinging *muſically*, he would have onely bid them praiſe in the general, and have left out the outward expreſſion of it, which cannot be acted but in a ſet form.

6. If ſinging were not in a muſical manner, (as before) it were the ſame with prayer, for you may ſing out a prayer, and praiſe in praying. Thus in *David's*

Pſalms. How many Pſalms which were matter only of petition, yet were ſung with faith and confidence in God? For performance, the Apoſtle *James* diſtinguiſheth them apparently, *Is any ſick? let him pray; is any merry? let him ſing Pſalms*; and the other Apoſtle, *Let us pray with the Spirit, and underſtanding, and ſing with the ſpirit, &c.* Now wherein lies the difference? In prayer you have variety of workings, and conſiderations; there is *Deprecation, Imprecation, Acclamation*, and *Admiring, pleading*, and *urging promiſe*, and the like. So in ſinging, there are the like; the difference is only in the ſet, and muſical way, of expreſſion, which requires a more ſet form before-hand to rule my outward carriage by, in that Ordinance; whereas in prayer we are not tied to ſuch a ſeverity of method, and ſo need not have our words ſo formed.

Another plea, which is ſomewhat ſcurrilous, by the ruder ſort, yet much urged, is, that we *lye* when we ſing Pſalms, and affirm that we cannot but *lye* when we ſing the phraſes of many Pſalms. As that of *David, O Lord I am not puffed in minde, I am as a weaned child*, &c.

To which I reply, in general, that ſome may not have the frame of theſe expreſſions, when they ſing, and ſo may perform a duty which may be but as a lye to them. But,

1. In ſpecial, there is no Saint but can in ſome meaſure ſay whatever *David* ſaith in that or any other Pſalm, deſcribing the ſpiritual qualification of his

his heart; all graces are in every Saint there in the ſeed, and habit, and in a proportion, though all are not ſo eminent and apparent in the bud and fruit; though no godly man is free from pride, yet he cannot be a godly man that is a proud man *in actu ſignato*, which hath never been humbled, and brought out of himſelf; thus all along the 119. *Pſalm*, that Anatomy of a Saints inward parts, when *David* ſaith, *He delights in the Law of God, He hopes in Gods mercy, His ſoul longs after God, He keeps his Commandements, He hates every evil way*, &c. every godly man may ſing theſe and all other Pſalms, and ſpeak truth; for the reality of theſe frames are the ſame in every gracious heart.

2. Whatever I finde to be the caſe of any Saint, I may make it mine according to the likeneſs of my condition to it, and yet not a lye.

3. One great uſe of ſinging is to commend the excellency of ſuch graces which are and have been in others to ſweeten the harſhneſs of other duties, and to ſtir and quicken the heart to the endeavouring after ſuch like frames: therefore ſome Law-givers have put their Laws into verſe firſt, that the people might take a pleaſure in them, and ſing them as their recreations, and be the more inſinuated into obedience.

4. I can tell no lye ſo long as in the ſincerity of my ſoul I ſtudy my duty, and ſing with deſire after ſuch qualifications, from the contemplation of the beauty of them in ſuch holy men, though I do not finde the

preſent frame ſo high as I breath after, and ſuch men found at preſent.

Ob. But this Objection, grant it in its full Latitude, proves nothing againſt the nature of the Ordinance of ſinging, but the perſons who ſing, who are not fitly qualified to ſome expreſſions.

Again, others plead, Pſalms that are ſung are not ſutable to my condition.

Sol. 1. That is nothing ſtill againſt the Ordinance of ſinging; if it do not fit you, it fits others. But,

2. There is nothing in Scripture-expreſſions but all Saints at all times may make ſome uſe of in the very reading or ſinging, if not ſo particularly yet as to the general nature of inſtruction and edification, it is profitable; Saints muſt read all Scripture, with faith and underſtanding; though every place may not ſo directly open their preſent condition; and why may not they ſing as well all Pſalms?

3. It ſhould be the care of Officers in the Church, to be very choice in picking out Pſalms fit for the Church, according to the nature of the body, and times, and ſeaſons; and I could wiſh there were more choiceneſs obſerved in that particular; yet the Ordinance remains ſtill the ſame.

4. When I ſing any of theſe Pſalms, I ſhould by Faith perſonate the ſame ſtate of the Church, or the Saints, as when I apply promiſes made to others, I do their conditions, as if it were ſpoken to me.

5. It is for want of Divine ſtudy of the nature of theſe

these Scripture-expressions, and the mystery of them that we say such a Psalm is unsuitable to our conditions; for if when I read understandingly, I can get profit by them, I can the same when I sing them.

6. If it do not reach my condition, as to a particular case I am troubled withall, or the providence I am eminently under; yet it concerns the state of the Church, and I may sing them as a Member of the same body, and sympathising with them either in sorrow or joy, in afflictions or triumphs; which is a special way to act the graces of Saints, sometimes to sing what concerns others as themselves; as to pray for others as themselves; this is like Christs heart in heaven.

Lastly, You have opportunity enough to chuse Psalms for your emergencies. It is good to keep the harmony of the whole Body in the main.

Ob. That which follows next as urged against this truth, is, that its confusion to sing together, and that but one should sing at one time.

Sol. Still this is not against the Ordinance of singing. But,

1. Singing is more melodious and suitable, when performed by many, than one several instrument at one time: and so several voices make the greater Harmony: the excellency of singing lies in the Church, which is made up of divers voices.

2. Christ and his Disciples sung together, *Mat.* 26. 30. ὑμνήσαντες, they sung, *Paul* and *Silas*, Act 16. 25. *sung together in the Prison*, not one after another, but together.

Ob

Obj. But if any one ſay, when one prayes, all may be ſaid to pray, though he doth but conſent; it may be ſo in ſinging of Pſalms.

It is anſwered, 1. All Ordinances muſt be conſidered according to their proper nature; ſome Ordinances are ſo to be adminiſtred, as that onely one at once can perform it, as publick prayer, and preaching, and yet there muſt be a diſtinction even in theſe: my ſilence in prayer ought to be when I pray with another, and yet I may be ſaid to pray aſwell as he which is the mouth of the whole, becauſe my heart is with him in the ſame petitions, and my deſires go equally with him; but it is not ſo in preaching, where ſilence muſt be likewiſe from the nature of the Ordinance; yet though I conſent fully with the matter, and agree in all that is ſaid with never ſo much affection, yet I cannot be ſaid to preach, but onely he that ſpeaketh preacheth. So now as to ſinging there is a difference likewiſe of another conſideration; if onely one ſing, none elſe can be ſaid to ſing, though they joyn with the matter, and agree to it in their hearts; for its an outward act, and terminated in the perſon that performs it: and though in my ſilent conjunction, I may really praiſe God, yet I can in no ſenſe be properly ſaid to ſing with others, without I do uſe my Voice and Organs as they do. This conſideration will give light to men that mind the nature and diſtinction of Ordinances in their outward adminiſtrations.

2. That which is the confuſion of other Ordinances, is the beauty of this; for two to preach, or pray

pray together at the ſame time and place, were the greateſt confuſion imaginable; but for an hundred to ſing together is moſt harmonious, and pleaſant; ſo far from the breach of order, that harmony is moſt diſcovered by it.

3. It hath been the cuſtome of the Churches always thus to practice; and there is nothing in the nature of the Ordinance, or Divine precept, or example againſt it. I ſhall conclude this with a word from Antiquity, concerning this practice.

Euſeb. in his *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 33. quotes two Epiſtles of *Plinius Secundus* to *Trajan* the Emperour, teſtifying that Chriſtians were wont to gather themſelves before day to ſing Pſalms and Hymns together: the ſame doth *Philo Judæus* teſtifie, who lived in the Apoſtles time, as the ſame *Euſeb.* ſaith, *lib.* 2. *cap.* 22. Now in the time of *Plinius* and *Trajan*, did *John* the beloved Diſciple live, ſaith *Zanch.* in *Eph.* 5. 18, 19. whereby it appears an Apoſtolical Inſtitution.

Tertul. in his *Apol. c.* 19. ſaith, that it was a uſuall cuſtome among the Chriſtians, after their Love-feaſts, *canere de Scripturis Sanctis*, to ſing of the Scriptures; his meaning is, doubtleſs, out of, or from the Scriptures: In the Weſtern Churches this hath been the conſtant practice, though much corrupted by the *Roman* additions to Saints method; but yet that bleſſed Ordinance is now more ſpecially recovered, and made pure for Saints according to primitive inſtitution.

CAHP.

CHAP. V.

The great abuſes of the Roman *and* Epiſcopal *Church about this Ordinance, whereby many ſtick not to call it Antichriſtian, hath been;*

1. THe introducing muſical Inſtruments together with, as Organs, Harps, Viols, &c. whereas in the New Teſtament God requires the Voice as the only Organ of the heart in worſhip.

2. They had a meer order of Singers to whom they gave penſions unto for that purpoſe, & excluded the Church from the perſons of that duty, which is of ſo Univerſal a concernment.

3. They would ſing in Latin, and with ſuch ſtrains of their Voices, that the words might not be underſtood.

4. They ſpent moſt of the time in ſinging, and gave not other Ordinances, as preaching, and praying, their due time of exerciſe. Thus have precious Ordinances been abuſed by the corruptions of men; but are now reſtoring unto their purity, and will every day be more gloriouſly practiſed in the Churches.

Chap. VI.

How we may be ſaid to teach and admoniſh one another, in Pſalms, Hymns, *and* Songs, *according to that of* Col. 3.16,17.

MAny think there can be no ſuch uſe of ſinging, as to teach and admoniſh one another by it; but if we conſider, there are many leſſons to be learnt one another from this publique conjunct, ſinging Scripture-Pſalms.

1. They teach one another, and by the very act admoniſh one another to get the ſame frames theſe *Holy* men had in the penning the Pſalms, and in the variety, and ſpirituality of them; to get *Davids* frame, in ſinging *Davids* P*ſalms:* and ſo for the reſt.

2. Its by this they teach one another the Unity & Harmony that is and ſhould be among *Saints* as one body, that their happineſs and joys are bound up together, & ſo the miſery of one, is the miſery of the whole; and this is a glorious leſſon to know their Union together, as a body equally concerned in the glory, or ſhame of one another, equally intereſted in the praiſes of God; there is no duty practiſed in all the *Goſpel* that doth fully expreſſe the Communion of *Saints*, and repreſent Heaven, as the *Saints* ſinging together, the Lords Supper doth repreſent the Communion of Saints very lively, but not ſo as mutuall

ſinging,

singing, when all at once, not by consent onely, but expresly speak the same thing in the same moment; in the Lords Supper, though afterwards they were all one bread, yet they all do not receive it at the same instant of time, but take successively the Elements; but in singing they all joyn perfectly at once to sound Gods praises, as if they had but one Lip, and one Voice. This is the perfect Embleme of Heaven, no jarring, all with one Voice and Heart, crying, *Hallelujah, Hallelujah.*

3. They teach one another this lesson also, *viz.* with what alacrity and cheerfulnesse they should perform all their duties together; with sweetnesse of love, and joy they ought to walk together.

4. They teach one another how to carry themselves in all conditions with joyfull and praising frames of spirit, for matter of the Psalms; and are various, not only affording matter of exultation, and gratulation; but also reciting the sadnesse and low condition of the Church; yet all are fit matter to be sung; *Lachryma* must be sung, sad things with a spiritual joyfull heart in God and his promises; mercy, and judgment in the same song, expresst in melody of the Voice and Heart; and it shews a soul is not in a right temper when he cannot sing over his condition.

5. They teach one another by singing, and admonish one another to avoid any thing that may hinder their joys in Communion, and break their Harmony in spiritual actings; all which, and many more

are

are great exhortations, and are taught naturally by Saints mutual singing together.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning singing with a mixt multitude.

MAny who grant singing to be an Ordinance among Saints, yet stumble to sing in promiscuous manner with others; especially because there are so many Psalms of such composition that doth not seem to concern a mixt multitude.

For opening of this, I must lay down this generall position; that prayer and praises are natural duties belonging to al men, men as men; though only the Saints can do them best, and spiritually; it is upon all men by the Law of Creation, to seek to God for what they want, & to thank him for what they have: this is due unto God, owning him as a Creator, and Benefactor; and though singing be a part of institutied worship, yet its onely an additio Order, & a regulation of a naturall duty. An there is no man but is bound to pray for mercie none are exempted from praising God for merc though they sing in a lower tune then Saints. Th *David* calls in all creatures to bless & praise God, as a natural duty according to their several capacities, *Psal.* 136. *Psal.* 117. *Psal.* 107. *Psal.* 103. *Psal.* 20, 21, 22. Praises, its the natural duty of all, the proper duty of Saints, the perfect act of Angels. *Ob.*

Ob. You will say they cannot perform it aright and glorifie souls.

Sol. 1. Their want of ability doth not discharge them from such a duty engraven on their consciences, and arising from the natural respects they have to God as a Creator; to perform which, God gave full power at first.

2. Let every man do his duty conscientiously, he may afterwards come to do it spiritually; though I should lose the sense of a duty in my conscience, yet the duty lyes on my conscience from Gods authority and my relation to him.

1. By the same rule every one should abstain from performance of a duty for want of present ability, whereas the duty must be done, and the strength expected from *Heaven*, and waited for according to the Divine manner of dispensation.

2. Its not unlawfull to joyn in any act with others or to countenance them in it, which is really their duty as well as our own; I cannot sin in joyning with any one in that act to perform, which is the duty of another, as mine, though he may want the present ability.

For duties must be measured according to the rule, not the abilities of the performer; now its no duty for any man to receive the Lords Supper, or be a Member of a Church in order to Communion, without he find himself in some measure fitted for grace; these sealing Ordinances of the Gospel, suppose, & require some other qualification, & are peculiar to visible

viſible Saints;but where there is a natural Charac-
er, or an Ordinance as to the ſubſtance of it, at leaſt
equally concerning all;there it is no ſin to joyn in
the adminiſtration of it; and if we conſider of it wa-
rily, unregenerate men are great ſharers in the mer-
cies of the Churches; beſides their own particular,
that they may well afford their voice without ſin,
and we joyn with them in ſetting forth Gods prai-
ſes: But more cloſely, and particularly.

1. When the Church and Saints of God are ga-
thered together to worſhip him, in ſinging; it is no
more unlawfull to ſing with others that ſtand by
and joyn their voices, than when in prayer they
ſtand by,and give their conſent,we do not ſo much
joyn with them as they do own Gods actings a-
mong us:it is no ſin in them to joyn with us in ſuch
a duty,neither can it be any ſin in us to ſing,though
others very carnal will outwardly praiſe God with
us.

2. The carriage of Saints in their hearty and real
expreſſions of prayſes may convince others in the
coldneſs, and lowneſs of their ſpirit, and ſtir t
up to ſome ſpiritual apprehenſions.

3. Though it be lawful to joyn with them in
a duty generally conſidered,yet it were to be wiſ
in a mixt multitude, there were more care in the
choice of Pſalms, to fit them to the very duty of
praiſe and thanks,which is ſo really belonging to all
theCongregation:& that muſt be lamented,that the
choice ofPſalms,to a mixt multitude,is not ſo con-
ſidered

sidered as it ought to be, which makes the ordinance so much slighted in its publique administration. But however, the incapacity of others to their duty, should not hinder me from performing mine, especially when I cannot, nor ought not to hinder others from such an act.

FINIS.